

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOLUME IX NUMBER 3

(Vol. LXXIII of the continuous series)

*December 1959*

OXFORD  
AT THE CLARENDON PRESS  
LONDON NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE

## THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

*Editors* C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

### BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	}	<i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)		
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.		
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.		
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)		
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society		
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society		
<i>With the co-operation of</i>		
Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,		
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and		
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton		

*New Series*

*Volume IX, No. 3*

*December 1959*

### CONTENTS

The Sources of Stesichorus, fr. 74 (B.) and Sappho, fr. 2. 5 (L.-P.)	D. L. PAGE 193
Pindar, <i>Olympian Odes</i> 6. 82-86	K. J. DOVER 194
Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i> 11-20	K. J. DOVER 196
The Hoopoe's Song (Arist. <i>Birds</i> 227 ff.)	A. M. DALE 199
Seven Emendations	D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY 200
Two notes on the <i>Satires</i> of Horace	J. H. KELLS 202
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i> 986	R. E. WYCHERLEY 205
Himerius and Athena	W. H. PLOMMER 206
Lucretius iii. 961-2	K. F. C. ROSE 207
Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> i. 32	D. S. ROBERTSON 208

### REVIEWS:

*Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, W. K. C. GUTHRIE, J. M. C. TOYNBEE, D. M. JONES, 208;  
*The Mycenae Tablets*, ii (Bennett), *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos* (Bennett), A. J. BEATTIE, 213; *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* (Lejeune), A. J. BEATTIE, 221; *The Decipherment of Linear B* (Chadwick), D. M. JONES, 222; *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Landau), D. M. JONES, 225; *From Mycenae to Homer* (Webster), *Homer and the Homeric Tradition* (Whitman), J. A. DAVISON, 227; *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Thummer), H. J. ROSE, 231; *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Radt), H. T. DEAS, 233; *Anacreon* (Gentili), D. L. PAGE, 234; *Safo* (Galiano), D. L. PAGE, 238; *Aeschylus* (Weir Smyth, Lloyd-Jones), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 239; *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Stanford), D. MERVYN JONES, 242; *Callimachus* (Trypanis), H. LLOYD-JONES, 244; *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. xii (Cherniss, Helmbold), D. A. RUSSELL, 246; *Aelian, On Animals* vol. i (Scholfield), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 247; *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Brown), H. D. WESTLAKE, 249; *Order and History*, ii, iii (Voegelin), G. B. KERFERD, 251; *Aristotle's*

*[continued on p. 3 of cover]*



## EDUCATIONAL PARTY TRAVEL

(Students—Teachers and the  
Young at Heart)

**LONDON-GREECE-LONDON**

**20 days inclusive £54. 0s. 0d.**

Second Class rail—Tourist Class sea

We now accept applications for  
participation in the following:—

**8 April 1960 (Easter celebrations)**

**28 June 1960 (Epidaurus Festival)**

**29 July 1960 (Olympic Games)**

**30 Aug. 1960 (Caique Isles Cruise)**

**OCEANWAYS S.S.  
AGENCY LTD.**

**23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus,  
London, S.W. 1**

## GREECE AND ITS ISLES

Land of perpetual sunshine.  
Birthplace of hospitality. Isles  
of Greece cruises. Pullman  
Coach Tours. Hotels. Railways.  
Marine passages. Tourist re-  
sorts. Ask your own travel  
agent for leaflets and the Hand-  
book, or

**OCEANWAYS S.S. AGENCY  
LTD.**

**23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus,  
London, S.W. 1**

Phone: TRA 6055

Cables: Dakoglu-London



## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.    †W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

†E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, L.H.D.    E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400–700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series  
is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end  
of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1960

#### LATIN

416. AUGUSTINE. *City of God*. Seven volumes, Vol. VI. Translated by W. C. Greene.

#### GREEK

449. AELIAN. *On the Characteristics of Animals*. Vol. III. Translated by A. F. Scholfield.  
391. ARISTOTLE. *Organon—Posterior Analytics and Topics*. Translated by H. Tredennick and E. S. Forster.  
430. LUCIAN. Eight volumes, Vol. VI. Translated by K. Kilburn.  
425. PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. Fifteen volumes, Vol. IX. Translated by W. C. Helmbold, E. Minar, and F. H. Sandbach.

**William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey**

**HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.**

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

**Editors** C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2  
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

*All communications intended for the Editors should be sent to Mr. Fordyce. Books for review should be sent to the Editors, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford.*

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

Professor E. H. Warmington, M.A. (Chairman)	} <i>Representing the Council of the Classical Association</i>
Professor R. G. Austin, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. Sandbach, M.A.	
Professor F. W. Walbank, M.A., F.B.A.	
Professor W. S. Watt, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
A. G. Woodhead, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. Platnauer, B.Litt., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

*With the co-operation of*

Professor B. D. Meritt, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton,  
Professor J. A. FitzHerbert, University of Adelaide, and  
Professor Homer A. Thompson, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton

*New Series*

*Volume IX, No. 3*

*December 1959*

## CONTENTS

The Sources of Stesichorus, fr. 74 (B.) and Sappho, fr. 2. 5 (L.-P.)	D. L. PAGE	193
Pindar, <i>Olympian Odes</i> 6. 82-86	K. J. DOVER	194
Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i> 11-20	K. J. DOVER	196
The Hoopoe's Song (Arist. <i>Birds</i> 227 ff.)	A. M. DALE	199
Seven Emendations	D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY	200
Two notes on the <i>Satires</i> of Horace	J. H. KELLS	202
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i> 986	R. E. WYCHERLEY	205
Himerius and Athena	W. H. PLOMMER	206
Lucretius iii. 961-2	K. F. C. ROSE	207
Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> i. 32	D. S. ROBERTSON	208

## REVIEWS:

*Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, W. K. C. GUTHRIE, J. M. C. TOYNBEE, D. M. JONES, 208;  
*The Mycenae Tablets*, ii (Bennett), *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos* (Bennett), A. J. BEATTIE, 213; *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* (Lejeune), A. J. BEATTIE, 221; *The Decipherment of Linear B* (Chadwick), D. M. JONES, 222; *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Landau), D. M. JONES, 225; *From Mycenae to Homer* (Webster), *Homer and the Homeric Tradition* (Whitman), J. A. DAVISON, 227; *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Thummer), H. J. ROSE, 231; *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Radt), H. T. DEAS, 233; *Anacreon* (Gentili), D. L. PAGE, 234; *Safo* (Galiano), D. L. PAGE, 238; *Aeschylus* (Weir Smyth, Lloyd-Jones), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 239; *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Stanford), D. MERVYN JONES, 242; *Callimachus* (Trypanis), H. LLOYD-JONES, 244; *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. xii (Cherniss, Helmbold), D. A. RUSSELL, 246; *Aelian, On Animals* vol. i (Scholfield), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 247; *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Brown), H. D. WESTLAKE, 249; *Order and History*, ii, iii (Voegelin), G. B. KERFERD, 251; *Aristotle's*

[continued on p. 3 of cover]

## EDUCATIONAL PARTY TRAVEL

(Students—Teachers and the  
Young at Heart)

### LONDON-GREECE-LONDON

20 days inclusive £54. 0s. 0d.

Second Class rail—Tourist Class sea

We now accept applications for  
participation in the following:—

8 April 1960 (Easter celebrations)

28 June 1960 (Epidaurus Festival)

29 July 1960 (Olympic Games)

30 Aug. 1960 (Caique Isles Cruise)

### OCEANWAYS S.S. AGENCY LTD.

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus,  
London, S.W. 1

## GREECE AND ITS ISLES

Land of perpetual sunshine.  
Birthplace of hospitality. Isles  
of Greece cruises. Pullman  
Coach Tours. Hotels. Railways.  
Marine passages. Tourist re-  
sorts. Ask your own travel  
agent for leaflets and the Hand-  
book, or

### OCEANWAYS S.S. AGENCY LTD.

23 Haymarket, Piccadilly Circus,  
London, S.W. 1

Phone: TRA 6055

Cables: Dakoglu-London



## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D. †W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

†E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

L. A. POST, L.H.D. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A., F.R.HIST.SOC.

Founded by JAMES LOEB

*Each volume Foolscap 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 15s. net*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

"We shall never be independent of our Loeb."—*Times Literary Supplement*.

### NEW VOLUMES, 1960

#### LATIN

416. AUGUSTINE. *City of God*. Seven volumes, Vol. VI. Translated by W. C. Greene.

#### GREEK

449. AELIAN. *On the Characteristics of Animals*. Vol. III. Translated by A. F. Scholfield.

391. ARISTOTLE. *Organon—Posterior Analytics and Topics*. Translated by H. Tredennick and E. S. Forster.

430. LUCIAN. Eight volumes, Vol. VI. Translated by K. Kilburn.

425. PLUTARCH. *Moralia*. Fifteen volumes, Vol. IX. Translated by W. C. Helmbold, E. Minar, and F. H. Sandbach.

William Heinemann, Ltd., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey  
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

[1 front]

Books on  
**CLASSICAL ANTIQUITY**

Byzantium and the  
Middle Ages

---

Large and small collections bought, or individual items, e.g.:  
Critical Editions, indexes, monographs, Teubners, standard col-  
lections of texts, inscriptions, papyri, palaeography, M.G.H, the  
Latin Thesaurus, Evans's Palace of Minos and Scripta Minoa,  
B.M. Catalogues of Coins, &c. &c.

---

**W. HEFFER & SONS LTD.**

Petty Cury, Cambridge

*Telephone: 58351*

*Telegrams: Heffer, Cambridge*

## **Merit and Responsibility**

**A Study in Greek Values**

**ARTHUR W. H. ADKINS**

This book surveys Greek values as exemplified in literature from the *Iliad* to the philosophical writings of Aristotle. It is intended both for the classical scholar and for the general reader concerned with questions of human behaviour and morals. 42s. net

## **Plato: Gorgias**

**A Revised Text with Introduction and Commentary by**

**E. R. DODDS**

This is the first annotated edition in English since 1890. The text and *apparatus criticus* are based on a fresh survey of the evidence, account is taken of new material, and the commentary discusses historical, philosophical, and literary questions generally ignored by nineteenth-century editors. 45s. net

**OXFORD CLASSICAL TEXTS**

## **A. Persi Flacci et D. Iuni Iuvenalis Saturnae**

**Edited by W. V. CLAUSEN**

**This supersedes the edition by S. G. Owen**

**15s. net**

## **Aristotelis Ars Rhetorica**

**Edited by SIR DAVID ROSS**

**25s. net**

**OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS**

# HELLENIC TRAVELLERS CLUB

## 1960 Hellenic Cruises

Under the patronage of the Vice-Chancellors of Oxford, Cambridge,  
Glasgow, Aberdeen, and Reading Universities

**Cruise No. 18      SARDINIA, SICILY, NORTH AFRICA,  
MALTA, GREECE, AND YUGOSLAVIA**

**2 April to 18 April 1960**

*Visiting* SAVONA, CAGLIARI, NORA, PALERMO, MONREALE, SEGESTA, TUNIS, CARTHAGE,  
DOUGGA, AGRIGENTO, TRIPOLI, SABRATHA, LEPIS MAGNA, MALTA, SYRACUSE, OLYMPIA,  
DELPHI, OSIOS LOUKAS, CORFU, PALAEOKASTRITSA, DUBROVNIK, TORCELLO, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 19      GREECE, TURKEY, AND YUGOSLAVIA**  
**16 April to 2 May 1960**

*Visiting* VENICE, OLYMPIA, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, DELOS, MYKONOS,  
CAPE HELLES, GALLIPOLI, TROY, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, PERGAMUM, SELJUK,  
EPHESUS, ANTALYA, PERGE, ASPENDOS, SIDE, RHODES, LINDOS, KNOSSOS, MALLIA,  
GORTYNA, PHAESTOS, PYLOS, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 20      SICILY, GREECE, TURKEY,  
AND THE BLACK SEA**

**23 August to 10 September 1960**

*Visiting* SAVONA, SYRACUSE, OLYMPIA, KNOSSOS, RHODES, LINDOS, SELJUK, EPHESUS,  
CAPE HELLES, TROY, BURGAS, NESSEBER, VARNIA, THE BOSPHORUS, ISTANBUL, PERGAMUM,  
DELOS, MYKONOS, ATHENS, DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, CORINTH, SICYON, PATRAS,  
TORCELLO, VENICE.

**Cruise No. 21      GREECE, TURKEY, CYPRUS, LEBANON  
AND YUGOSLAVIA**

**8 September to 26 September 1960**

*Visiting* VENICE, OLYMPIA, NAUPLIA, EPIDAUROS, ASINE, MYCENAE, TIRYNS, ATHENS,  
DAPHNI, ELEUSIS, SOUNION, DELOS, MYKONOS, RHODES, LINDOS, ANTALYA, PERGE,  
ASPENDOS, SIDE, LIMASSOL, NICOSIA, KYRENIA, FAMAGUSTA, SALAMIS (Optional Air  
Excursion to JERUSALEM and BETHLEHEM or DAMASCUS and PALMYRA), BEIRUT, BYBLOS,  
BAALBECK, MALLIA, KNOSSOS, DUBROVNIK, VENICE.

*Each Cruise will be accompanied by six guest lecturers who  
will give lectures on board and at the various sites visited.*

**Guest Lecturers accompanying Cruises include**

Mr. J. Boardman, Sir Maurice Bowra, Sir William Calder, Lord David Cecil, Sir Harry Luke,  
Mr. Michael MacLagan, The Rev. Gervase Mathew, The Rev. Canon Guy Pentreath, Professor  
W. B. Stanford, Professor Eric G. Turner, Mr. J. B. Ward Perkins, Sir Mortimer Wheeler, Mr.  
D. R. Wigram, and Sir John Wolfenden.

### PRICES FROM 85 GUINEAS

INCLUDING TRAVEL LONDON-VENICE AND RETURN

*For full particulars and reservations apply to*

**W. F. & R. K. SWAN (Hellenic) LTD.**

**260 (H 7) Tottenham Court Road, London, W. 1**

Telephones: MUSeum 8070 (12 lines)

# The Classical Review

NEW SERIES VOLUME IX NO. 3

(VOLUME LXXIII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

December 1959

## THE SOURCES OF STESICHORUS FR. 74 (BERGK) AND SAPPHO FR. 2. 5 (L.-P.)

I. STESICHORUS fr. 74 (fr. 73 first ed.). This has come down unchanged through the editions of *Poetae Melici* thus:

'Etymol. Vindob. cod. CLVIII: ἄιος· ὄνομα παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ.'

So it has been repeated from one book to another ever since, apparently unchecked. 'Cod. CLVIII' (properly Phil. gr. CLVIII) is not a likely source for a unique reference to Stesichorus: it has long been known to contain the *Gudianum* (with a missing central portion supplied from a close relative of the *Genuinum*, later contaminated from a copy of the true *Gudianum*; Reitzenstein, *R.E.* vi. 1. 815); and Professor Lesky, who has recently inspected the manuscript at my request, tells me that its entry for ἄιος is the same as in the other manuscripts of the *Gudianum* as given by Sturz (23. 7) and de Stefani (58. 6)—i.e. *there is no quotation from Stesichorus*. I have long regarded this reference with suspicion, and have wondered whether the true source might be the *Lexicon Vindobonense* (Phil. gr. CLXIX); but Professor Lesky tells me that that has no lemma ἄιος at all. It looks as though we must simply take this quotation on trust, until somebody can identify Bergk's source. That would be a specially unsatisfactory state of affairs, if this were indeed the sole authority for the fragment; but fortunately another source does exist—the lexicon of Cyril in Cod. Bodl. Auct. T. II (11), f. 90, to which L.S.J. refer, s.v. ἄιος (cf. Addenda, *ibid.*, p. 2045), and which Latte first published in *Mnemos.* iii. 10 (1941), 84. Mr. Lloyd-Jones has now read the manuscript and confirmed the text for me as follows:

ἄιος· ὁ παράσθησι χοροδῶς ὁ αἰών.

It is by no means certain how this should be interpreted. Latte suggested that the entry ended at παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ, the remainder being a correction of the beginning, and the true reading αἰώς· ὁ αἰών, παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ. Lloyd-Jones suggests a conflation of two entries, ἄιος· ὁ(νομα) παρὰ Στησιχόρῳ. Αἰώς· ὁ αἰών. These are not the only possibilities; and it must be recognized that the occurrence here of αἰώς = αἰών is only conjectural. The existence of an inscrutable ἄιος (ἄτος) is confirmed (as Lloyd-Jones observes) by Choerob. ap. An. Ox. Cramer ii. 171. 19, however unlikely the explanation may appear: αἰος· σημαίνει δὲ τὸν ἀκούοντα . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰών, αἰος.

Corrupt though it is, Cod. Bodl. must in future be quoted as our primary source for this fragment.

II. Sappho fr. 2. 5(=4 Bergk). Bergk, giving as his primary source 'Hermog. Walz Rhēt. III 315', adds 'Schol. ib. VII 883 ἀμφὶ δὲ ὕδωρ ψ. κ. δι' ὁσδων μαλίνων. sed Schol. V 534 recte ὕσδων et sic Et. Vindob. cod. CCV f. 109: ὕσδος ὁ ὄζος παρ' Αἰολεῦσιν. οἱτοὶ γὰρ τρέπουσι τὸ ὄ εἰς ὕ καὶ τὸ ξ διαλύουσιν εἰς τὸ ὄ καὶ δ, ὡς παρὰ Σαπφοῖ· ἀμφὶ δὲ ὕδωρ ψυχρόν κελαδεῖ δι' ὕσδων μαλίνων.'

Where did Bergk find this last source? Certainly not where he says, in 'Et. Vindob. cod. CCV f. 109'. Professor Lesky allows me to quote him as follows: 'Der cod. CCV, den Bergk anführt, ist eine Miscellanhandschrift, die 106 v.–134 r. *Maximus Planudes* περὶ συντάξεως enthält. In ihr ist dieses Zitat nicht zu erwarten und auf fol. 109 auch in der Tat keine Spur davon. Ich habe dann die anderen etymologischen Lexika und sonstigen Lexika unter den Handschriften der Nat. Bibl. zu Rate gezogen, konnte aber Bergk's Text auch dort nicht entdecken.' Schol. V 534 (Walz) is itself, as it happens, by Planudes; but it is not the same as Bergk's excerpt, and in particular lacks the specific quotation παρὰ Σαπφοῖ.

It is very odd that Bergk, whose source-quotations are very nearly all easily traceable, should offer us two excerpts, neither of which is to be found where he says, in two different manuscripts of an alleged 'Etymologicum Vindobonense'. I do not know where to look further.<sup>1</sup>

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

## PINDAR, *OLYMPIAN ODES* 6. 82–86

δόξαν ἔχω τιν' ἐπὶ †γλώσση· ἀκόντας λιγυράς†  
 ἃ μ' ἐθέλοντα προσέρπει καλλιρόαισι προαῖς,  
 ματρομάτωρ ἐμὰ Στυμφαλῖς, εὐανθῆς Μετώπα,  
 πλάξιππον ἃ Θήβαν ἔτικτεν, τὰς ἐρατεινὸν ὕδωρ  
 πίομαι κτλ.

82 *punctum post γλώσσα hab.* ABH POxy 1614; *om. cett.* λιγυράς ἀκόντας Bergk 83  
 προσέρπει E<sup>VP</sup> (-οι) G<sup>VP</sup> H<sup>VP</sup>; cf. Σ<sup>A</sup> -ρόαισι POxy; -ρόοισι codd.

PROFESSOR A. J. BEATTIE has recently reminded us<sup>2</sup> that δόξαν ἔχω ἐπὶ *c. dat.* means 'I have a reputation for . . .'. His point is valid even without the limitation 'ἐπὶ *c. dat.*'. δόξα is a common word in Pindar, and with the exception of *N.* 11. 24 ἐμὴν δόξαν ('judgement') and possibly *O.* 10. 63 ἐν δόξῃ θέμενος εὐχος 'expectation' he uses it in the sense 'reputation', 'fame', 'glory'. δόξαν ἔχω 'have a reputation' is normal from the sixth century onwards, e.g. Alc. D 14. 12, Solon 1. 4, *I.G.* xiv. 652. 3, Pind. *P.* 8. 24, Eur. *Med.* 540, fr. 659. 10 (= Critias fr. 15), Thuc. iv. 126. 5; cf. the many examples of δ. λαβεῖν, δ. εὐρεῖν, δ. φέρειν, etc. On the other hand, the sense 'entertain a belief' is unexampled before the fourth century. In any case, 'I have a belief' (or 'illusion', or 'sensation') 'of a whetstone upon my tongue' is not a Greek form of metaphor and does not mean 'There is, as it were, a whetstone upon my tongue'. It follows that unless we fail to make sense of *O.* 6. 82 ff. by translating δόξαν as 'reputation' we need not consider the many interpretations<sup>3</sup> which translate it otherwise.

<sup>1</sup> I am deeply indebted to Professor Lesky and Mr. Lloyd-Jones for their help, and for allowing me to use their work and quote them as I have done. Since both the Viennese references turned out to be false, Professor Lesky and his assistants were put to great expense of time and trouble; nothing

could exceed the courtesy with which my tiresome inquiries were pursued.

<sup>2</sup> *C.R.*, n.s. vi. 1 f.

<sup>3</sup> Including those of the scholia, which uniformly explain δόξα as δόκησις. This in turn is paraphrased by Σ<sup>BR</sup> as ὁ δοκῶ περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν.



Professor Beattie, reading ἐπὶ γλώσσας ἀκόνα λιγυρᾶς (which retains the word-order of the manuscripts) and ἀλλ' for ᾧ μ', interprets thus: 'I have a certain reputation for the sharpening power of my tongue; but' (i.e. despite the effectiveness of my native talent, as shown by its power over other men) 'I am glad that Metopa approaches me and inspires me.' My interpretation differs from his in that (i) the coyness of 'I have a certain reputation' seems to me to conflict with the tone of Pindar's other references to himself (Eur. *El.* 939 is perhaps the earliest example of τις with the overtone 'good' or 'big'), and (ii) I think that good sense can be made of ᾧ μ'.

τιν' I take to be purely informative, as in *P.* 4. 247 καὶ τινα οἶμον ἴσαμι βραχύν, *N.* 9. 6 ἔστι δέ τις λόγος ἀνθρώπων; thus δόξαν ἔχω τιν' . . . ᾧ . . . = 'Among the good things said of me, there is one which . . .', or 'I have one (claim to) fame, (among others), which . . .'.<sup>1</sup>

Since, on any interpretation, 83 says something about poetic inspiration, the most natural sense for the rest of 82 is: '(which acts as) a whetstone to my tongue,<sup>1</sup> (making it) clear-sounding', a phrase in apposition to δόξαν.<sup>2</sup> This sense would be given by ἐπὶ γλώσσας ἀκόναν λιγυρᾶς. My only doubt is whether the relation between a whetstone and that which it sharpens is properly described by ἐπὶ *c. gen.* If not, then (i) if Pindar wrote προσέρπει in 83, ἐπὶ *c. gen.* could express arrival, as commonly, the form of the expression being determined by the movement implicit in 83: '(which, acting as) a whetstone, (comes) to my tongue (and makes it) clear-sounding'; or (ii) if Pindar wrote προσέλκει—as I think he did—we may, with Bergk, transpose the last two words of 82, keeping the terminations as in the manuscripts, ἐπὶ γλώσσα λιγυρᾶς ἀκόνας, in which case λιγυρᾶς is a transferred epithet and the genitive is appositional (cf. Eur. *Supp.* 715 ὄπισμα τοῦπιδαύριον . . . δεινῆς κορύνης): '(consisting of) a whetstone upon my tongue (which makes my tongue) clear-sounding'.

Manuscripts and papyrus agree on προσέρπει, but προσέλκει is recorded as a v.l. in manuscripts of one branch<sup>3</sup> of the Vatican family and is also clearly implied by the explanation προσάγει in Σ<sup>A</sup>. Let us defer decision for a moment, treating the first half of 83 as 'which —s me', and consider the second half.

καλλίρ(ρ)οος is applied exclusively to rivers and springs; cf. the wide distribution of Καλλιρ(ρ)όη as a name of springs and water-nymphs. The words καλλιρόαισι πνοαῖς therefore tell us at once something about the nature of the δόξα; it has a connexion with a river or spring; and 84 is specific: 'my mother's mother, a Stymphalian (nymph), flowery Metopa, who bore Theba, whose sweet water I drink'. So far, then: 'Among the good things said of me, there is one . . . which —s me πνοαῖς of a lovely stream, (namely) . . . Metopa.' To take the person Metopa in apposition to a relative pronoun which refers to the reputation grounded upon that person seems to me no harder than calling a person a glory, reproach, or grief; cf. *Il.* xvi. 498–9 σοὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ ἔπειτα κατηφείη καὶ οὐκ εἰδος ἔσσομαι, 22. 435 καὶ σφὶ μάλα μέγα κῦδος ἔησθα ζωὸς ἐών.<sup>4</sup> Anyone who does find it objectionable may punctuate strongly after 83 and take ματρομάτωρ as the beginning of a fresh statement, understanding ἐστίν.

<sup>1</sup> For Pindar's metaphorical treatment of γλώσσα see Beattie, loc. cit., Woodbury, *T.A.P.A.* 1955, p. 31, and Pearson, *C.R.* xlv. 210. Of many examples, *N.* 7. 70–72 is perhaps the most striking.

<sup>2</sup> So Σ<sup>BE</sup>: δ δοκῶ περὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, τοῦτό μοι ἀκόνη ἐστίν, and ὁξὺς ὢν ὀξύτερος γίνομαι

παρ' ἀκόνης τῆς δοκῆσεως θηγόμενος.

<sup>3</sup> In both, according to Turyn's stemma; but I am following Irigoin here.

<sup>4</sup> Appositional phenomena discussed in Kühner–Gerth, i. 282. 1 A 1, 284. 6, Schwyzler, ii. 615 Zus. 1, may also have some relevance here.

Returning now to 83: our choice is between (i) 'which approaches me—and I welcome it—to the *πνοαί* of a lovely stream', and (ii) 'which draws me—and I do not resist it—to the *πνοαί*, etc.' (cf. *I. 6. 69* ἄσται κόσμον ἐὼ προσάγων). Since the gods may 'breathe into' a man strength, the power of song (*Hes. Th. 31*), or an impulse to action (*Od. xix. 138–9*), the boy Alcimedon by his victory at Olympia πατρὶ δὲ πατρὸς ἐνέπνευσεν μένος (*Pind. O. 8. 70*), and the Bacchants on Cithaeron were θεοῦ πνοαῖσιν ἐμμανεῖς (*Eur. Bacc. 1094*), καλλιρόαισι πνοαῖς might perhaps describe the inspiration which Pindar derives from the thought of Metopa. However, while pain, emotions, desires, and hope come to a man (e.g. προσέρπει, προσέρχεται τόδ' ἐγγύς *Soph. Ph. 787–8*, χαρά μ' ὑφέρπει *Aesch. Ag. 270*, ἔμπερος . . . μοι ἐπῆλθε *Hdt. i. 30. 2*), and a 'cloud of forgetfulness' comes over the mind (ἐπὶ . . . βαίνει, *Pind. O. 7. 45*), subjects of song do not come to Pindar; he goes to them (e.g. *O. 6. 22 ff.*, *I. 4. 3*) or shoots them from afar. This consideration tells decisively in favour of προσέλκει; so does ἐθέλοντα, which has more point if Pindar is being moved than if something is approaching him. Recalling ἡδὺ πνεῖν = 'smell good', I suggest that καλλιρόαισι πνοαῖς are the fresh smell of a lovely stream of water, such as may literally 'draw' or 'attract' a man, cf. *Hymn Pan 9* ρεῖθροισιν ἐφελκόμενος (passive) μαλακοῖσιν.

As elsewhere, Pindar blends the literal and the metaphorical inseparably. He means: 'Reflection upon the fact that I am called a Theban stimulates my utterance and induces me to speak of Metopa the mother of Theba.' But he says: 'Among the good things said of me, there is one—it acts as a whetstone to my tongue, making it clear-sounding—which draws me—and I do not resist it—to the smell of a lovely stream, (for it is) my mother's mother, a Stymphalian (nymph), flowery Metopa, who bore Theba. . . .' Compare the similar blending in the same poem, 22 ff.: 'Yoke me the mules, that . . . I may come to a genealogy; they know the way; throw open the gates of song for them; I must arrive today at Pitana on the Eurotas, (Pitana) who bore Evadne. . . .'

University of St. Andrews

K. J. DOVER

## ARISTOPHANES, *KNIGHTS* 11–20

THE two slaves who have been conversing in ll. 1–9 intone l. 10 together. It is therefore impossible to decide which of the two speakers distinguishable in 1–9 speaks 11–12, and we are free to call him 'A'.

A poses the question 'surely we ought to be thinking of a plan?', and B, who has no ready answer, says (13)

τίς οὖν γένοιτ' ἄν; λέγε σύ.

inviting A to speak.<sup>1</sup> Now, A has no answer either, but he does not want to betray this. He conceals his impotence by courtesy (13–14)

σὺ μὲν οὖν μοι λέγε,  
ἵνα μὴ μάχωμαι.

'No, you say—I don't want to quarrel about it.' B outdoes him in courtesy, and

<sup>1</sup> Vahlen, *Opuscula* ii (Leipzig, 1908), of the manuscripts' assignation of λέγε σύ 271 ff., says all that need be said in defence to the same speaker as τίς οὖν γένοιτ' ἄν;

in doing so makes it plain even to the densest spectator that neither slave has an idea and neither is willing to admit the fact (14-15)

μὰ τὸν Ἀπόλλω 'γὼ μὲν οὐ.  
ἀλλ' εἰπὲ θαρρῶν, εἴτα καὶ γὰ σοὶ φράσω.

'Oh, no, no, not I! Come on, don't hesitate, tell me, and then I'll tell you mine!' This is gentle satire upon the 'after you!' game which we sometimes play when we want to conceal our ignorance. There is more of this type of satire in Aristophanes than is sometimes seen; two obvious examples are the creditor of *Nu.* 1214-21 trying to talk down his own embarrassment, and the young man of *Pl.* 1076-9 pretending to renounce magnanimously what he is in fact glad to get rid of.

Impasse. Silence. Then a guilty, dangerous thought strikes both of them, and one of them—let us call him A, since B spoke last, but it could still be B—voices his feelings by quoting the line with which Phaedra in Eur. *Hipp.* 345 expresses her agonized reluctance to speak (16):

πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξεις ἀμέχρη λέγειν;

'If only *you* would say what it is for *me* to say!' B knows what A is thinking; he is thinking the same himself; but he confesses his own reluctance (17):

ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνι μοι τὸ θρέττε.

'Oh, but τὸ θρέττε isn't in me!' This enigmatic word is explained in a muddled Scholion simultaneously as 'confidence' and οὐδὲ τὸ τυχόν ἔχω περὶ τούτων εἰπεῖν.<sup>1</sup> Its formal affinities are, on the one hand, with θρεττανελό in *Pl.* 290, 296, an imitation of a musical instrument, and, on the other hand, with the war-cries παῖε, βάλλε, etc. The former has no relevance here, and the latter offer some slight support to what is in any case a reasonable guess. B's point is: 'I haven't quite the dash (the drive, guts, the face) to say it outright.' Then he wonders how to put the ugly idea in elegant obscurity (17-18):

πῶς ἂν οὖν ποτε  
εἴποιμ' ἂν αὐτὸ δῆτα κομψευρικῶς;

The 'guilty thoughts' humour of 16-18 has now gone far enough, and needs to be broken off; this is done by making the mention of Euripides provoke from A the familiar joke about vegetables (19), and in 20, which makes the suggestion of desertion plainly, the way is cleared for the next joke.

In this interpretation I have kept the order of lines and the distribution between speakers exactly as they are in the manuscripts. So do Neil (with a little hesitation), Rogers (with a mistranslation of l. 14), and Erbse, none of whom, however, seems to me to see where the humour of the passage lies. Various transpositions have been favoured by the majority. Sauppe, with the approval of Vahlen and van Leeuwen, transposed 15 and 16 in order to make ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔνι μοι τὸ θρέττε answer ἀλλ' εἰπὲ θαρρῶν; a frivolous reason for transposition. Herbert Richards,<sup>2</sup> followed by Coulon, put 16 after 18, on the ground that the quotation from Euripides should follow πῶς ἂν οὖν . . . κομψευρικῶς. It is, however, pointless for one and the same speaker, after wondering how

<sup>1</sup> Pohlenz, *N.A.W.G.* (Ph.-hist.), 1952, pp. 106 f., translates 'Ich habe nicht die geringste Ahnung, was du meinst', comparing such expressions as *Ach.* 1035 οὐδ' ἂν στριβιλίκιγξ. Erbse, *Eranos*, lii (1954), 103,

points out that the definite article differentiates τὸ θρέττε from those expressions.

<sup>2</sup> *Aristophanes and Others* (London, 1909), p. 13.

he can 'say it', i.e. put his plan forward, in Euripidean fashion, to quote a line which throws the whole proceedings back to the previous stage by expressing a wish that he did not have to speak at all. Moreover, there is no dramatic objection to allowing the Euripidean line to pass without comment while the explicit mention of Euripides provokes a horrified reaction. Aristophanes several times in this play puts into the mouth of a speaker a tragic line appropriate in sense to the comic situation, and by that very fact humorous in its own right, without making any other speaker comment on its tragic character, e.g. 813 (composite), 1240, 1244 (almost certainly tragic), 1302 (adapted?).

These are comparatively trivial considerations. A much more powerful influence upon editors and critics is the long-standing identification of the two slaves with Demosthenes and Nicias.<sup>1</sup> The speaker of 40-72 is 'Demosthenes' since he complains in 45-57 that he made the 'Laconian loaf' which the Paphlagonian stole and served up to Demos—a thin disguise for the parts played by Demosthenes and Cleon in the reduction of Sphacteria. This identification has meant that the speakers of 11-20 are regarded not as A and B but as 'Demosthenes' and 'Nicias', and that the text must be so ordered that neither of the two says anything out of character; in particular, the words *ἵνα μὴ μάχωμαι* must be spoken by 'Nicias'. It has been assumed that the identity of the slaves is made plain to the audience by portrait-masks; Pohlenz goes so far as to say that this is essential for the understanding of the humour of the scene.

Now, if I am right in supposing that a brief silence falls after line 15, and that 16 may or may not be spoken by the same person as 15, the identification of the speakers in 11-15 is freed from any necessary relation to the distribution of lines from 16 onwards. There is, however, a bigger issue at stake. In the manuscript tradition of Aristophanes the *sigla personarum* sometimes represent the firm adoption of what was in origin a tentative conjecture. So the Old Man of *Th.*, a kinsman of Euripides, nowhere named in the text of the play, becomes 'Mnesilochus', since that was the name of Euripides' father-in-law (*Vita Eur.* 5). So too the First Creditor of *Nu.* 1214 ff. becomes 'Pasiās' (cf. 21), the Scholar of 1505 'Chaerephon', and a speaking part is found for the statue of Hermes in 1478 ff. It is therefore not surprising that the slaves of *Eq.* are *Δημ(οσθένης)* and *Νικ(ίας)*. The Hypotheses, by contrast, speak with exemplary caution. Neither Hypothesis hesitates over the identification of the Paphlagonian, but Hyp. i offers no identification of his *ὁμόδουλοι*, while Hyp. ii says *ἔοικεν ὁ προλογίζων εἶναι Δημοσθένης* and *λέγουσι δὲ τῶν οἰκετῶν τὸν μὲν εἶναι Δημοσθένην τὸν δὲ Νικίαν, ἵνα ᾧσι δημηγόροι οἱ δύο*.

These last words illuminate the part played in the identification by conceptions of dramatic symmetry. It is dramatically desirable, given that the Paphlagonian is Cleon, that the two other slaves should consistently represent real individuals. It is certain that if the speaker of 40-72 consistently represents any real individual, he represents Demosthenes. It then becomes doubly desirable that the remaining slave should consistently represent a real individual. There is room for difference of opinion on the extent to which Aristophanes would have acquiesced in our demands for symmetry and for consistency; but if my scepticism on this general issue is misplaced, let me still plead for caution on three points of a more particular character:

- (i) If the second slave represents a real person, Nicias is not necessarily the

<sup>1</sup> Especially in K. F. Hermann, *Progymnasmata ad Aristophanis Equites* (Marburg, 1835).

best candidate. We have been influenced by Thucydides' selection, emphasis, and portrayal of the events of 425; so had the Hellenistic scholars; Aristophanes had not.

(ii) If the slave is Nicias, he is not necessarily invested with the character which the Sicilian Expedition, several years after *Eq.*, revealed in Nicias.

(iii) In the whole of the opening dialogue of *Eq.* there is no passage which requires for the appreciation of its humour any knowledge of the character of any real person.

University of St. Andrews

K. J. DOVER

## THE HOOPOE'S SONG

(Aristophanes, *Birds* 227 ff.)

In the course of his illuminating Notes on the Hoopoe's Song (*Eranos*, xlviii, 1950) Eduard Fraenkel shows how closely *Birds* 229–59 follow the pattern of a κλητικός ὕμνος with its repeated τε connecting the different sections. The birds 'are arranged in groups according to their habitat and food', and he shows conclusively that l. 240 must be taken as a single group, birds of the hills who feed on the hill-shrubs oleaster and arbutus. τὰ κοτινοτράγα and τὰ κομαροφάγα are thus in effect in apposition to τὰ κατ' ὄρεα, as indeed many translators have taken them—but without altering the text. His objections to this are cogent: (1) the hearer would inevitably take the second and third τε as connective like the first, instead of subordinated to τὰ κατ' ὄρεα; (2) metrically, the analysis into iamb-dochmiac, as in Schroeder

τά τε κατ' ὄρεα	τά τε κοτινοτρά-	iamb. dim.
-γα	τά τε κομαροφάγα	doch.

is ineffective because of the muddle of short syllables undefined by word-end (unlike the preceding dochmiacs which detach themselves neatly from their surroundings). His remedy is to excise the second τε ('as soon as we expel it, everything runs smoothly') and scan as a period of 6 iambic metra, ending with catalexis:

τά τε κατ' ὄρεα	τά τε κοτινοτράγα	~~~~~	~~~~~
τά τε κομαροφάγ'	ἀνύσατε πέτό-	~~~~~	~~~~~
μενα πρὸς ἑμὴν αἰδάν.		~~~~-	~-

But the trouble is that everything does not yet run smoothly enough. Aristophanes has a habit of keeping his metrical fantastics exquisitely clear by means of word-end, whereas in this version the last 4 metra are an untidy jumble. The charming rhyme κοτινοτράγα . . . κομαροφάγα is destroyed, and the calling effect of ἀνύσατε which gathers up *all* the groups from 230 onwards—ὅσοι τ' . . . , ὅσα τ' . . . , ὅσα θ' . . . , τά τε . . . is swallowed in the preceding elision; the received text which gives hiatus and period-end, followed by change of rhythm at ἀνύσατε, is clearly right. Manuscript authority is divided between αὐδάν and αἰδάν: by choosing the latter Schroeder and Fraenkel achieve not only some awkwardly resolved iambs but a catalexis which is alien in style to the metrical character of the whole piece, whereas with αὐδάν the line scans itself:

ἀνύσατε | πέτόμενα | πρὸς ἑμὴν | αὐδάν ~~~~~ ~~~~~ ~~- --

Anapaests of this type recur at 328, again with the clearly defined syllable-groups: *προδεδομέθ' ἀνόςιά τ' ἐπάθομεν*. Thus not only the second *τε* but the third also needs to be deleted in 240:

τά τε κατ' ὄρεα | τὰ κοινοτράγα | τὰ κομαροφάγα,

leaving iambic groups which sing themselves. (Nor does one really want the hill-birds divided into those that eat oleaster *and* those that eat arbutus; a mixed diet would be more natural.) Euripides in the previous year had resorted to the same device to set a sung trimeter of solo-lyric at the farthest possible distance from a spoken one (*Trö.* 1312):

Πρίαμε Πρίαμε | σὺ μὲν ὀλόμενος | ἄταφος ἀφίλος

So too in 233 trochaic resolution is defined by word-end:

ταχὺ πετόμενα | μαλθακὴν ἔντα γῆρυν

and each of the rarer metres (for comedy) is similarly demarcated:

230	ὅσοι τ' εὐσπόρους   ἀγροίκων γύας	dochmiac
231	νέμεσθε φύλα   μυρία κριθοτράγων	iambelegus
238	ὅσα θ' ὑμῶν   κατὰ κήπους   ἐπὶ κισσοῦ	ionics

Characteristic of the song, and highly unusual in general, are the acatalectic rhythms ending in a short syllable and followed by pause and change of metre: thus 233-4 and 235-6 trochaic || dochmiac, 240-1 resolved iambic || anapaests, 253-4 open dactyl || paroemiac, 259-60 trochaic || bird-noises. The music (and solo-dance?) must have been punctuated by the oddest pauses and unexpected turns.

Birkbeck College, London

A. M. DALE

## SEVEN EMENDATIONS

(1) Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1327 ff.

ὡς βρότεια πράγματ'· εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν  
σκιά τις ἂν πρέψειεν· εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ,  
βολαῖς ὑγρώσσων σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφήν  
καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκείνων μάλλον οἰκτίρω πολύ.

Whatever the exact sense of *εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ . . . γραφήν* (Wecklein seems right to me: see Denniston-Page), 1327-9 must be a comparison between man's lot in adversity and in prosperity, to the disadvantage of both states. And, to quote Denniston-Page: 'It should be noticed that the difference between *εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν* κτλ. and *εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ* κτλ. corresponds exactly to the difference between the present positions of Agamemnon and Cassandra.' With due humility I must add that *ταῦτα* in 1330 cannot naturally mean anything but adversity, such as Cassandra's, nor *ἐκείνων* anything but prosperity, such as Agamemnon's. The objection is that the line so taken is the merest bathos: 'I pity adversity [such as my own] far more than prosperity [such as his].' I think Cassandra meant precisely the opposite, and should say *κοῦ*, not *καί*. Her case was indeed more pitiable than Agamemnon's, but not much more.

(2) Cicero, *Pro Cluentio* 76

non nulli autem severi homines qui hoc statuerunt, quo quisque animo quid faceret spectari oportere, etsi alii pecunia accepta verum iudicabant, tamen nihilo minus se superioribus suis iudiciis constare putabant oportere; itaque damnarunt.



The jury in the Oppianicus trial, says Cicero, fell into four categories. First, the notoriously corrupt; as a result of Staienus' manoeuvres these voted for conviction. Second, those who did not see their way to acquit an obviously guilty man nor yet to convict when there was a suspicion of bribery by the other side; these voted *non liquet*. Third, some severely inclined jurymen decided that their colleagues' motives were not relevant. If other people were paid to give a just verdict, that was no reason why *they* should give an unjust and inconsistent one; so they found Oppianicus guilty. Finally there were the five votes for acquittal; motives various.

My paraphrase assumes *spectari* <non> *oportere*. In the vulgate Cicero, like Cassandra, is made to say the contrary of what he must have meant.

(3) Cicero, *Ep. ad Brutum* 1. 7. 2 (Brutus)

Bibulum noli dimittere e sinu tuo, tantum iam virum ex quanto (crede mihi) potest evadere qui vestris paucorum respondeat laudibus.

Watt, the latest editor, prints *paucorum* with 'suspectum' against it in his apparatus. It is quite senseless. Read *fautorum*: 'Already he has reached a stature which gives promise of one who one day will justify the praises of you, his promoters.' *vestris* refers to Cicero and Bibulus' other friends in Rome: cf., for example, *Att.* iii. 24. 1 *vestro consensu*. *fautor* is a common Ciceronian word, and the genitive is normal: see Kühner-Stegmann, i. p. 245, for many examples like *Fam.* xv. 13. 1 *tuum studium adulescentis perspexi*. *p* for *f* as in *Att.* ix. 5. 1 *infero/impero*, ix. 7C. 2 *fabrum/partium*: *t* and *c* of course are perpetually confused in manuscripts.

(4) Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 98

existunt eadem coronae circa lunam et circa nobilia astra caeloque inhaerentia.  
caelo quoque *E(?)o*

Pliny must be saying that halos are also seen round the moon, planets, and fixed stars: cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* ii. 101 *καὶ αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας δὲ τοὺς τε πλανωμένους καὶ τοὺς λαμπροὺς τῶν ἀπλανῶν ἄλως συνιστάμεναι κτλ.* The vulgate makes him exclude the planets. Even if it could mean 'autour des autres les plus éclatants, en particulier des étoiles fixes' (Beaujeu), Pliny certainly did not mean that. The old reading *caelo quoque* must be brought back: 'around the specially bright stars, including the fixed ones.' *nobilia* corresponds to Ptolemy's *λαμπροὺς*.<sup>1</sup>

(5) Pliny, *N.H.* xviii. 321

nos legum utilitas, quae in toto opere, in hac quoque movet parte.

For *legum* read *legentium*.

(6) Tacitus, *Germania* 42. 2

sed vis et potentia regibus ex auctoritate Romana. raro armis nostris, saepius pecunia iuvantur, nec minus valent.

Read *valet*.

(7) Juvenal 13. 147

confer et hos, veteris qui tollunt grandia templi  
pocula adorandae robiginis et populorum

<sup>1</sup> *nobilia* would be tempting if *mobile astrum* meant *meantium modo siderum* . . . *sed multorum etiam* could be paralleled. Yet cf. § 106 *nec adhaerentium caelo*.

Anapaests of this type recur at 328, again with the clearly defined syllable-groups: προδεδόμεθ' ἀνόσιά τ' ἐπάθομεν. Thus not only the second τε but the third also needs to be deleted in 240:

τά τε κατ' ὄρεα | τὰ κοινοτράγα | τὰ κομαροφάγα,

leaving iambic groups which sing themselves. (Nor does one really want the hill-birds divided into those that eat oleaster *and* those that eat arbutus; a mixed diet would be more natural.) Euripides in the previous year had resorted to the same device to set a sung trimeter of solo-lyric at the farthest possible distance from a spoken one (*Trö.* 1312):

Πρίαμε Πρίαμε | σὺ μὲν δλόμενος | ἀταφος ἀφίλος

So too in 233 trochaic resolution is defined by word-end:

ταχὺ πετόμενα | μαλθακὴν ἔντα γῆρυν

and each of the rarer metres (for comedy) is similarly demarcated:

230	ὅσοι τ' εὐσπάρους   ἀγροίκων γύας	dochmiac
231	νέμεσθε φύλα   μυρία κριθοτράγων	iambelegus
238	ὅσα θ' ὕμῶν   κατὰ κήπους   ἐπὶ κισσοῦ	ionics

Characteristic of the song, and highly unusual in general, are the acatalectic rhythms ending in a short syllable and followed by pause and change of metre: thus 233-4 and 235-6 trochaic || dochmiac, 240-1 resolved iambic || anapaests, 253-4 open dactyl || paroemiac, 259-60 trochaic || bird-noises. The music (and solo-dance?) must have been punctuated by the oddest pauses and unexpected turns.

Birkbeck College, London

A. M. DALE

## SEVEN EMENDATIONS

(1) Aeschylus, *Agam.* 1327 ff.

ὡ βρότεια πράγματ'· εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν  
σκιᾷ τις ἂν πρέψειεν· εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ,  
βολαῖς ὑγρώσων σπόγγος ὤλεσεν γραφὴν  
καὶ ταῦτ' ἐκείνων μᾶλλον οἰκτίρω πολὺ.

Whatever the exact sense of εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ . . . γραφὴν (Wecklein seems right to me: see Denniston-Page), 1327-9 must be a comparison between man's lot in adversity and in prosperity, to the disadvantage of both states. And, to quote Denniston-Page: 'It should be noticed that the difference between εὐτυχοῦντα μὲν κτλ. and εἰ δὲ δυστυχῇ κτλ. corresponds exactly to the difference between the present positions of Agamemnon and Cassandra.' With due humility I must add that ταῦτα in 1330 cannot naturally mean anything but adversity, such as Cassandra's, nor ἐκείνων anything but prosperity, such as Agamemnon's. The objection is that the line so taken is the merest bathos: 'I pity adversity [such as my own] far more than prosperity [such as his].' I think Cassandra meant precisely the opposite, and should say *κοῦ*, not *καί*. Her case was indeed more pitiable than Agamemnon's, but not much more.

(2) Cicero, *Pro Cluentio* 76

non nulli autem severi homines qui hoc statuerunt, quo quisque animo quid faceret spectari oportere, etsi alii pecunia accepta verum iudicabant, tamen nihilo minus se superioribus suis iudiciis constare putabant oportere; itaque damnarunt.



The jury in the Oppianicus trial, says Cicero, fell into four categories. First, the notoriously corrupt; as a result of Staienus' manoeuvres these voted for conviction. Second, those who did not see their way to acquit an obviously guilty man nor yet to convict when there was a suspicion of bribery by the other side; these voted *non liquet*. Third, some severely inclined jurymen decided that their colleagues' motives were not relevant. If other people were paid to give a just verdict, that was no reason why *they* should give an unjust and inconsistent one; so they found Oppianicus guilty. Finally there were the five votes for acquittal; motives various.

My paraphrase assumes *spectari* <non> *oportere*. In the vulgate Cicero, like Cassandra, is made to say the contrary of what he must have meant.

(3) Cicero, *Ep. ad Brutum* 1. 7. 2 (Brutus)

Bibulum noli dimittere e sinu tuo, tantum iam virum ex quanto (crede mihi) potest evadere qui vestris paucorum respondeat laudibus.

Watt, the latest editor, prints *paucorum* with 'suspectum' against it in his apparatus. It is quite senseless. Read *fautorum*: 'Already he has reached a stature which gives promise of one who one day will justify the praises of you, his promoters.' *vestris* refers to Cicero and Bibulus' other friends in Rome: cf., for example, *Att.* iii. 24. 1 *vestro consensu*. *fautor* is a common Ciceronian word, and the genitive is normal: see Kühner-Stegmann, i. p. 245, for many examples like *Fam.* xv. 13. 1 *tuum studium adolescentis perspexi*. *p* for *f* as in *Att.* ix. 5. 1 *infero/impero*, ix. 7C. 2 *fabrum/partium*: *t* and *c* of course are perpetually confused in manuscripts.

(4) Pliny, *N.H.* ii. 98

existunt caedem coronae circa lunam et circa nobilia astra caeloque inhaerentia.  
caelo quoque *E(?)o*

Pliny must be saying that halos are also seen round the moon, planets, and fixed stars: cf. Ptol. *Tetr.* ii. 101 καὶ αἱ περὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας δὲ τοὺς τε πλανωμένους καὶ τοὺς λαμπροὺς τῶν ἀπλανῶν ἅλως συνιστάμεναι κτλ. The vulgate makes him exclude the planets. Even if it could mean 'autour des autres les plus éclatants, en particulier des étoiles fixes' (Beaujeu), Pliny certainly did not mean that. The old reading *caelo quoque* must be brought back: 'around the specially bright stars, including the fixed ones.' *nobilia* corresponds to Ptolemy's λαμπροὺς.<sup>1</sup>

(5) Pliny, *N.H.* xviii. 321

nos legum utilitas, quae in toto opere, in hac quoque movet parte.

For *legum* read *legentium*.

(6) Tacitus, *Germania* 42. 2

sed vis et potentia regibus ex auctoritate Romana. raro armis nostris, saepius pecunia iuvantur, nec minus valent.

Read *valet*.

(7) Juvenal 13. 147

confer et hos, veteris qui tollunt grandia templi  
pocula adorandae robiginis et populorum

<sup>1</sup> *nobilia* would be tempting if *mobile astrum* meant *modo siderum* . . . sed multorum etiam could be paralleled. Yet cf. § 106 nec *adhaerentium caelo*.

dona vel antiquo positas a rege coronas.  
 haec ibi si non sunt, minor exstat sacrilegus qui  
 radat inaurati femur Herculis et faciem ipsam  
 Neptuni, qui bratteolam de Castore ducat.  
 an dubitet solitus totum conflare Tonantem?

Knoche deletes the last line, as Housman wished to do. Clearly there is no help in *hau* (Leo) . . . *solus* (Goth. 52 and 53) or *stolidus* (Hadr. Valesius). In *solidum* I think there is. Juvenal addresses a friend who has been cheated (144 ff.): 'Look at the greater crimes all around us, robbery, arson, sacrilege. If there are no great golden cups or wreaths to steal in the temples, a lesser thief comes to scrape the gilding from parts of the statues.' 153 answers a possible objection, that so far as the value went, the thefts of 150-2 were no great matter. That, says Juvenal, is only because there is nothing better to steal. The man who scrapes the gilt from a lesser god's thigh would not hesitate to melt down Jupiter himself in solid gold entire—if he had the chance.

*Jesus College, Cambridge*

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

## TWO NOTES ON THE SATIRES OF HORACE

### (1) *Sat. i. 3. 25-27*

cum tua peruideas oculis mala lippus inunctis,  
 cur in amicorum uitis tam cernis acutum  
 quam aut aquila aut serpens Epidaurius?

peruideas] non uideas *rec.*, praeuideas *Bentl.*, praetereas *Mervilius* mala] male *rec.* *Bentl.*

*peruideas* has never been explained satisfactorily, nor emended convincingly. The general sense required is 'when you overlook your own faults, why is your sight so keen where those of others are concerned?' (Cf. the comic poet cited by Plutarch π. πολυπραγμ. 1, π. εὐθυμίας 8: τί τ' ἀλλότ' ἰδὼν, ἄνθρωπε βασκανώτατε, / κακὸν ὁρῶσθαι, τὸ δ' ἴδιον παραβλέπει; the form of the apophthegm is merely inverted in Horace, and also he has embroidered in, after his fashion, certain details, i.e. *oculis lippus inunctis* and the hyperbole of the eagle and the Epidaurian serpent.)<sup>1</sup> But *peruiderere* cannot in itself mean 'to overlook', and in fact means the opposite: as Bentley said, "*peruiderere*" *ubique significat acute et perspicue et penitus rem uidere*. The answer to this difficulty which was usual in his day, and which goes back to the scholiasts ('cum tua mala oculis inunctis lippus peruideas, i.e. cum tua mala uideas quasi caecus', 'cum tua mala uideas uelut si lippus inunctus sis') was that *peruideas* has its natural meaning here effectively modified by its association with *oculis lippus inunctis*, so as to give in fact the required meaning; *peruideas* together with *oculis lippus inunctis* is an example of oxymoron (so Dacier), in which it is the second element which dominates the sense; for to 'see clearly or discern like a purblind man' is not to discern at all, i.e. is to overlook; comparable are Horace, *S. i. 2. 91* Hypsaea caecior illa, / quae mala sunt spectes, and *Od. iii. 7. 21* scopulis surdior Icari / uoces audit. Bentley, however, pointed out the weakness in this interpretation when he said that the examples would support only 'lippus uideas'. For the

<sup>1</sup> The sentiment recurs in Latin coupled to the image of the two knapsacks: Phaedr. iv. 10. 4 f. hac re uidere nostra mala non possumus; / alii simul delinquant, censores

sumus; Cat. 22. 21 sed non uidemus manticae quod in tergo est; Pers. 4. 23 f. ut nemo in sese temptat descendere, nemo, / sed praecedenti spectatur mantica tergo.

association of the intensive compound *peruidere* with an adjective of opposite meaning, no strict parallel is quoted, nor is there any reason to be seen why Horace should have combined the two here: as Bentley remarked, you do not get over a difficulty by merely calling it a figure. Unfortunately, editors have not attended to Bentley's objection, and are mostly content to repeat the old explanation, some (e.g. Krüger, Wickham, Lejay, Kiessling) adding that *peruideas* here is 'ironic': again, one asks what is the point of the irony (that the general tone of the passage is ironic is no reason why particular ironic emphasis should reside in this particular word), and whether some more literal expression of the sense 'overlook' is not required to balance the literal *cernis acutum*? (Antithesis is also a figure, and most editors do not seem to see that a very good example of it is spoiled here by this peculiar interpretation of *peruideas*.) Those, however, who, either from the above objections or from a general feeling that *peruideas oculis lippus inunctis* is an impossibly clumsy way for Horace to express 'overlook', reject the interpretation have either (like Bentley) offered unconvincing emendations of *peruideas*, or attempted, equally unconvincingly, to show that the word here means something different from its accepted meaning.<sup>1</sup>

The difficulty disappears, and all becomes clear, if *male* is read<sup>2</sup> and, as Gesner tentatively suggested,<sup>3</sup> construed with *peruideas*: *male peruidere* is one of a host of expressions<sup>4</sup> in which a verb, the natural meaning of which is determined in one sense either by the simple meaning of the verb or by the prefix with which it is compounded, is negated, or so modified as to bear a sense opposite to its original sense, by *male*. *male peruidere* expresses the opposite of *peruidere*, i.e. 'not to discern', 'to overlook', and so *peruideas male* provides a clear antithesis to *cernis acutum*: not merely do these two phrases balance each other, but also the other elements in the lines fall into symmetry, *quam aut aquila aut serpens Epidaurius* (two elements) balancing *oculis lippus inunctis* (two elements): the lines become elegant, instead of being a hotch-potch.

This interpretation is so satisfying that it may well seem a mystery why it has been ignored. The explanation no doubt depends upon word-order. If *male* were read, it is assumed that it would go with *lippus*,<sup>5</sup> the association of *male* with a following adjective being common, whereas *male* modifying a verb is rarely found following that verb,<sup>6</sup> and there is no other instance, as far as

<sup>1</sup> e.g. *peruidere* = 'quasi de longinquo uidere' (Baxter), 'parum oder male uidere' (Hirschfelder), 'darüber hinsehen' (Schmalz). Palmer thought that 'the preposition is not to be too much pressed', but it is difficult to see why he thought that Ov. *M.* xiv. 375 *qui peruidet omnia solem* supports this idea.

<sup>2</sup> *male* (despite the lines of Phaedrus cited in note 1, p. 202) is in any case the better reading. *mala* is not needed in the Horatian line, since *uitia* can easily be supplied from *uitiis*—a subtler and more elegant form of expression. But a scribe in a hurry to give a construction to *tua* might easily change *male* to *mala*.

<sup>3</sup> 'possis etiam ita, cum tua uitia male peruideas.'

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cat. 61. 141 m. te a tuis glabris

abstinere; Cic. *Verr.* ii. 3. 227 m. perceptos fructus (here = 'not sufficiently garnered in', 'inadequately received', a meaning which shades into the plain negative 'not [received] at all', according to context); Hor. *Epist.* i. 20. 15 m. parentem asellum; S. ii. 6. 87 tangentis m. singula dente superbo ('practically not touching'); Ov. *Am.* i. 14. 51 lacrimas m. continet, *Pont.* i. 2. 111 m. compositos cineres, *F.* i. 559 seruata m. parte boum (i.e. 'lost'); Tac. *H.* i. 172 m. coercitam famam, etc.

<sup>5</sup> Bentley, who printed *male*, took it with *lippus*; Orelli assumes that, if read, it would go with *lippus*.

<sup>6</sup> Examples of negative *male* so placed are S. ii. 6. 87 and Ov. *F.* i. 559 (both quoted above). For *male* after an adjective cf. Cat. 10. 33 sed tu insulsa male et molesta uiuis.

I know, of its doing so and at the same time being separated from the verb in hyperbaton. And if *male* is taken with *lippus*, the phrase *oculis male lippus inunctis* becomes an even clumsier qualification of *peruideas*. But the argument from word-order is invalidated by the following lines 31–32 *rusticius . . . toga defluit et male laxus / in pede calceus haeret*: here, despite the word-order, sense demands that *male* go with *haeret* (it may of course go ἀπὸ κοινοῦ with *laxus* as well, as it need not be prevented from doing with *lippus* on the suggested reading of line 25).<sup>1</sup> The fact is that, once granted the licence of hyperbaton, it is scarcely possible to lay down hard-and-fast rules as to when and how a writer might employ it, particularly a writer like Horace, who constantly uses the figure to give novelty and diversity to the otherwise pedestrian tone of the *Satires*.<sup>2</sup> My contention is that we should read *male* with *peruideas* here, if for no other reason than the very good one that the sense requires it.

(2) *Sat. i. 6. 3–6*

nec quod auus tibi maternus fuit atque paternus  
olim qui magnis legionibus imperitarent,  
ut plerique solent, naso suspendis adunco  
ignotos, ut me libertino patre natum.

6 ut D *Rp. ras.*; aut ut *Σ (acc. g)*; aut *Ψ (acc. q)*; at ut E natum *Ψ (acc. KM)*; natus C; natos aE g *R'n.l.*

The vulgate (ancient as well as modern, as far as concerns *ignotos*) version of line 6, printed above, cannot be the true reading, since it could never have produced the existing manuscript readings (cited here according to Klingner's apparatus). Seeing this, Arthur Palmer proposed *ignoto aut, ut me, libertino patre natos* (= the reading of g apart from the substitution of *ignoto* for *ignotos*). *ignotos*, as Palmer remarks, 'was the only corruption in the archetype': i.e. *ignoto* was originally altered to *ignotos* (very likely by a scribe not seeing what *ignoto* agreed with and in haste to give it a construction). Then *aut* (or its corruption *at*, preserved in E) dropped out, as metrically superfluous, in D and *Rprior. natos*, having nothing to agree with, was changed to *natum*.

It is difficult to see how this reasoning can be faulted, and Palmer's reading not accepted in consequence.<sup>3</sup> It can, however, be strengthened still further by two other considerations, first, that *ignoto aut, ut me, libertino patre natos* is to be preferred here on literary grounds, second, that there was a further cause for the corruption of this reading into the vulgate version in the shape of the recurrence of the phrase (*me*) *libertino patre natum* twice over at lines 45–46: *nunc ad me redeo libertino patre natum, / quem rodunt omnes libertino patre natum*.

To take the literary superiority first. Palmer's reading gives two emphases in the line, *ignoto*—*libertino*, rising to a climax which throws peculiar stress on *libertino*. This is just what is required for the sense, since the Satire is to be

<sup>1</sup> For intensive *male* with an adjective of negative quality cf. *male parius* (*S. i. 3. 45*) But *male* is not found elsewhere with *lippus* in Horace or, as far as I know, in Latin.

<sup>2</sup> The following may be taken as samples from Book i: 1. 70–72 *saccis—tamquam parcere sacris / cogeris*; 2. 62–63 *quid inter / est in matrona ancilla peccesse togata?*; 4. 74–75 *in medio qui / scripta foro recitent, sunt multi quique lavantes*; 5. 26 *impositum late saxis candentibus Anxur* (the reading of Kga, pos-

sibly correct as against the vulgate *saxis late*), 49 *namque pila lippis inimicum et ludere crudis*, 72 *paene macros arsit dum turdos uersat in igni*. The reason for the peculiar order of our line 25 is partly also the necessity to throw *tua* into prominence.

<sup>3</sup> I believe that Housman, in his Cambridge lectures on the textual criticism of Book i of the *Satires* approved Palmer's emendation on textual grounds.

about snobbery and false values as they relate to Horace's own life and particularly (in the early part from line 7 to line 48) to servile or near-servile parentage.<sup>1</sup> We should expect, then, Horace's own 'libertine' origin to be here more prominent, if anything, than the condition of persons who are generally *ignoti*. The vulgate reading, on the other hand, throws all the emphasis on *ignotos*, and makes the condition in which Horace is primarily interested a not particularly emphatic illustration of this general class of persons of lowly origin. The case is different at 45-46, where there is no prior emphasis in the lines, and *libertino patre natus* by itself bears the main emphasis. The repetition of the expression in the two adjoining lines shows the intense bitterness of Horace's feelings on the subject.

But (my second point) an ancient editor of more preciousness than sensibility might well seek to bring (*ignoto aut ut*) *me libertino patre natus* into conformity with the tag-like and twice-repeated (*me*) *libertino patre natus* of 45-46, even if more immediate palaeographic factors did not otherwise contribute to such a result.

University College London

J. H. KELLS

### THESMOPHORIAZUSAE 986

ADDRESSING a variety of deities, the chorus sing *τόρεψε πᾶσαν ὥδην*, if the text is correct. *τόρεψε* would surely bring to mind the fine art of *τορευτική*. But none of the commentators seems to have taken it in this sense. The Scholiast explains the line as meaning *τορῶς καὶ τρανῶς λέγε τὴν ὥδην*.<sup>2</sup> In L.S.J. the meaning of *τορεύω* in this context is given as 'to sing a piercing strain'. In fact a shrill piercing strain is hardly appropriate to the song which the women sing *ὅταν ὄργια σεμνὰ θεᾶν ἱεραῖς ὥραις ἀνέχωμεν* (948). Editors who do not emend *τόρεψε* mostly accept the explanation of the Schol. Translators give some vague equivalent which abandons the metaphor.

Bentley's suggestion<sup>3</sup> that one should read *τόρρεψε* has been favourably received. Blaydes

keeps *τόρεψε*, but remarks 'reponendum suspicor *χόρεψε*', which weakens the line intolerably. Van Leeuwen takes up this suggestion and rewrites the line *χόρεψε πᾶσ' ἄμ' ὥδην*.

There is no need to emend *τόρεψε*. *τόρρεψε* of course gives a good metaphor; it is used in line 54 of this play and elsewhere of verses and phrases skillfully rounded off.<sup>4</sup> *τόρεψε* gives an even better one. There is no need to take *τόρεψε* in any other sense than its usual one of working metal in elaborate designs.

L.S.J. correctly, if a little vaguely, gives the metaphorical sense of *τορευτός* as *elaborate*, quoting *A.P.* ix. 545 (Crinagoras), *Καλλιμάχου τὸ τορευτὸν ἔπος τόδε*.<sup>5</sup> The Schol. on *τορευτὸν* (see Stadtmüller) begins

<sup>1</sup> Cf. line 9 ante potestatem Tulli (the slave-girl's son, cf. Livy 4. 3, *patre nullo, matre serva*, and Juv. 8. 259) atque ignobile regnum, 21 *ingenus* si non essem *patre natus*, 29 *quis homo hic est? quo patre natus?* 36 *quo patre sit natus, num ignota matre inhonestus*, pointed by 38 ff. 'tune, *Syri Damae aut Dionysi filius, audes / deicere de saxo citus aut tradere Cadmo?* / at *Nouius collega gradu post me sedet uno; / namque est ille, pater quod erat meus* (i.e. a *libertinus*), and of course 45-46. These allusions show that, within the general question of the relationship of the well-born and the lowly free, it is the social problems connected with the near-servile origin of the latter that peculiarly interest Horace in this early part of the Satire. As the Satire proceeds to describe the later days of Horace's social security (lines 49 to the end), the viewpoint widens, and

the specific issue of near-servile origin tends to be lost sight of in the general problems of a lack of social 'background': cf. 58 *non ego me claro natus patre* (narro), 64 (*qui turpi secernis honestum non patre praeclaro*), 91 *quod non ingenuos habeat clarosque parentes* (as if the two things were much the same!), 130 f. *his me consolor uicturum suavius ac si / quaestor auus pater atque meus patruusque fuisset* (or whatever is the true reading in this disputed line).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Suidas, *τορεύει, τορῶς*.

<sup>3</sup> On Horace, *A.P.*, 441 (*tornatos*). Dindorf gives *τόρρεψε* (1825) but later prints *τόρεψε* and notes 'scribendum *τόρρεψε* cum Bentley' (1835); Coulon gives *τόρρεψε*.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plato, *Phaedrus*, 234 c.

<sup>5</sup> In *A.P.* vii. 274. 4 on the other hand (*γράμμα τορευθέν, Plan. τυπωθέν*) the word is used literally of an epitaph cut in a rock.

correctly *τορευτὸν σὺν πόνῳ καὶ ἀκριβείᾳ κατεσκευασμένον ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τῶν τορευόντων*, but appends a version of the Schol. on Aristophanes.

Aristophanes' hearers can hardly have failed to connect *τόρευε* with *τορευτική*, of which they had supreme examples in their great chryselephantine cult statues, besides many minor works.<sup>1</sup> Thanks to recent archaeological finds and studies we now know more about the character of the art and its relation to others. Dr. C. T. Seltman even calls *toeutike* 'this greatest of the arts, best beloved by the Greeks'.<sup>2</sup> Defining the nature of the art, he says; 'There was a comprehensive Greek word, *toeutike*, to describe it; meaning carving, chasing and engraving on gold, silver, bronze, ivory or gems.' Needing an English equivalent, he revives the obsolete 'celature'.

More precisely, Miss M. J. Milne has analysed the use of *τορεύω* and related words.<sup>3</sup> They are used most frequently of gold and silver work, less often of bronze, occasionally of a variety of other materials. In a concluding note she gives some metaphorical uses; on *Thesm.* 986 she merely expresses a preference for *τόρευε* as against *τόρνευε*, and adds 'I shall not venture to explain the metaphor'.

*τόρευε* refers to the expert and delicate elaboration of song and dance. In this one need not distinguish clearly between composition and performance. The word is untranslatable. Even the ingenious Seltman cannot provide a comprehensive verb by which one can convey the force of the fine Aristophanic metaphor.

R. E. WYCHERLEY

University College of North Wales

## HIMERIUS AND ATHENA

Himerius *Or.* 21. 4 (ed. G. Wernsdorff)

οὐκ αἰεὶ Δία Φειδίας ἐπλάττει, οὔτε σὺν ὅπλοις τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν ἐχάλκευετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς ἄλλους θεοὺς ἀφῆκε τὴν τέχνην 'καὶ τὴν Παρθένον ἐκόσμησεν, ἐρύθημα καταχέας τῆς Παρείας, ἵνα ἀντὶ κράνους ὑπὸ τούτου τῆς θεοῦ τὸ κάλλος κρύπτοιο.

<sup>1</sup> ἦ καὶ οὐ μόνην τὴν Reiske

'Pheidias was not always modelling Zeus, nor making bronzes of Athena with her weapons, but he also addressed his art to other gods and applied ornament to the Maiden, spreading a flush over her cheek, that the beauty of the goddess might be covered by this instead of a helmet'. (κρύπτοιο, I presume, because the radiance of her normal complexion would be too bright for the human eye.)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. D. B. Thompson in *Hesperia*, viii (1939), 313 ff.; and *Suppl.*, viii (1949), 365.

<sup>2</sup> *Approach to Greek Art*, p. 18; cf. p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *A.J.A.*, xlv (1941), 398 ff. Amongst the metaphors she notes Dion. Hal., *de Comp.* 25; *Thucyd.* 24; *Demosth.* 21. In the last she rightly prefers *περιτερόνευται* to *περιτετόρνευται* for the sake of consistency of metaphor; on the same principle, in *Thucyd.* 24 (*ῥινῶν καὶ τορευῶν*) *τορευῶν* would seem slightly preferable.

For *τορεία* meaning *ῥητορεία*, see Pollux vi. 141, Suidas s.v., and Schol. on *A.P.* ix. 545. It is hardly more than a play on words, and as is clear in Pollux it refers to elaboration of style rather than a penetrating voice.

I should like to draw attention also to Euripides, *H.F.* 978, *τόρνευμα* or *τόρνευμα*

I ignore Reiske's emendation, which seems to me to disturb the sense.

Modern scholars still toy with the view that Himerius' flushed goddess could be the unhelmeted standing Athena restored by Furtwaengler (*Masterpieces*, pp. 4 ff.) from the head in Bologna and the torsos in Dresden and considered by him to represent the Lemnian Athena of Pheidias, a famous bronze dedicated on the Acropolis by the Athenian cleruchs to Lemnos. Charles Picard, for instance, writes in the *Manuel d'archéologie grecque* (Paris, 1939); 'Un texte du rhéteur Himerios, s'il se rapporte bien à la Lemnia (il est parlé, au vrai, de la "Parthenos")', dit avec afféterie que le divin visage avait aux joues une aimable rougeur qui devait, . . . à la place du casque, dissimuler (?) sa beauté' (*Sculpture*, ii. 331). For

*δενὸν ποδός*, with reference to Herakles' frantic efforts to shoot his child who evades him by rushing behind a pillar. There seems to be manuscript authority for both words. The editors all give *τόρνευμα*. Paley thinks it implies rapid motion round the pillar. Wilamowitz says that Herakles is rather jumping from side to side. *πόρνευμα*, which is insufferably tame, or *χόρνευμα* has been suggested (see Paley's note). Without going fully into the problems of text, syntax, and interpretation involved in these lines—my interpretation of *Thesm.* 986 is not affected—I suggest that here too *τόρνευμα* should not be altogether ruled out; it might be used of a kind of boring or swivelling action of the foot as Herakles in his uncontrollable haste makes sudden rapid turns.



Miss Richter, among references which may perhaps be applied to this statue is '(2) a passage of Himerios to the effect that Pheidias did not always represent Athena armed, but sometimes substituted beauty for the helmet' (*Sculpture and Sculptors*, p. 225). Even Lippold (*Griechische Plastik*, p. 145) takes Himerius' passage as possibly a description of the Lemnia. Of these three scholars, Lippold and Miss Richter accept Furtwaengler's main theses. Only Picard, while not rejecting them, treats them 'with reserve' (p. 335), for reasons of sculptural style. But Himerius affords an important link in Furtwaengler's argument. For he alone, of all ancient authorities, has been thought to offer evidence for Furtwaengler's unhelmeted Athena Lemnia. Should these scholars have examined the passage more closely?

Furtwaengler himself positively stated that the statue was a bronze (*Masterpieces*, p. 7). This is partly because the technique of the Bologna head suggested bronze-work to him, but chiefly because Pliny seemed to him to be referring to the Lemnia in *N.H.* xxxiv. 54: 'Phidias . . . fecit . . . ex aere vero, praeter Amazonem supra dictam, Minervam tam eximiae pulchritudinis ut formae cognomen accepit.'

But Himerius cannot be describing a bronze. It was surely not ancient practice to rouge the cheeks of bronzes. Apart from a few small metal inlays, nothing would be allowed to interrupt the bronze surface. See, for instance, Miss Richter, *Greek Etruscan and Roman Bronzes* (New York, 1915), pp. xxvi ff. Rouge on a bronze cheek would look not beautiful but grotesque.

Himerius must surely be describing the Parthenos, as he says. We know from copies that the two hinged cheek-guards of her helmet were fully raised. Her very unguarded face is shown best, I think, on the Koul-Oba medallions. Picard (op. cit., p. 386) doubts this and prefers the gem of Aspasius. But he shows only the inferior medallion (contrast *A.M.* viii, pl. xv); and both were made in the late fourth century, when art was still Greek, long before any other known copies (cf. Ebert, s.v. Koul-Oba, p. 117). The beauty of such a goddess would not have seemed to Himerius to be covered by her helmet. Again, the colouring of ivory was a time-honoured craft, as we know from the famous simile of *Iliad* iv. 141 ff. It was not, perhaps, so long a step technically from the cheek-pieces of horses to the coloured cheeks of the Parthenos.

One should probably press Himerius no farther. It seems a little strange that he should contrast the Parthenos, who had her *ὄπλα*, with bronze Athenas *σὺν ὀπλοῖς*. Does *σὺν ὀπλοῖς* normally mean 'fully armed and ready to fight', as it does, perhaps, in Thucydides ii. 2? Was Himerius merely contrasting the Parthenos, in her easy attitude, with the bronze Promachos outside, who admitted of no *γυναικεῖος κόσμος*? In any case, he would hardly have worried, even if he had noticed that most fifth-century Athenas were as unguarded as the Parthenos, and had nothing but pudding-basins to protect them. But he affords no evidence at all that there was a Lemnian Athena, who had even less.

Cambridge

HUGH PLOMME

### LUCRETIUS iii. 961-2

nunc aliena tua tamen aetate omnia  
mitte,  
aequo animoque aedum magnis concede;  
necesses.

*Aedum* is the unmetrical reading of OQ, and has been altered by the Itali to *agedum*; this has been accepted by most editors. It is also generally felt that a dative is required with *concede*, though the manuscript reading clearly does not give the required sense. The nominatives *magnus* (Munro), *gnavus* (Nenini), and *Maccus* (?) have not won any favour. On the assumption that any emendation should include a dative which supplies the sense required, Marullus's *agedum iam aliis* is the most satisfactory; but this is metrically harsh, though not impossible for

Lucretius. Only Merrill has not accepted *agedum*; nevertheless I feel that the correction is by no means certain.

I therefore conjecture *age, nunc aliis*. The corruptions NC-M and LI-G seem quite easy. Once the corruption had developed, a scribe might easily have altered the text by substituting words familiar to him; hence the reading of OQ. The sense is echoed by Epictetus, *Diss.* iv. 1. 106; *ἐξέλθε, ἀπαλλάγηθι, ὡς εὐχάριστος, ὡς εὐδαίμων δὸς ἄλλοις τόπον. δεῖ γενέσθαι καὶ ἄλλους*. . . . The sentiment of l. 962 is represented in its entirety by Epictetus here, if the reading *aliis concede* is correct. The resemblance between the two passages is striking.

Exeter College, Oxford

K. F. C. ROSE

TACITUS, *ANNALS* i. 32

'Cassius Chaerea, mox caede Gai Caesaris memoriam apud posteros adeptus, tum adulescens et animi ferox, inter obstantis et armatos ferro viam patefecit.'

No one seems to have questioned the text, but the tense of *adeptus*, appropriate in a continuous narrative, is awkward in a passing allusion to something which at the moment described still lay in the distant future. Tacitus often uses *mox* with the

future, and I have noticed several examples with the future participle: the most relevant to the present passage is perhaps *Agric.* 13. 5 'adsumpto in partem rerum Vespasiano, quod initium venturae mox fortunae fuit'.

I suggest that Tacitus wrote 'mox caede Gai Caesaris memoriam apud posteros adepturus'.

Trinity College, Cambridge D. S. ROBERTSON

## REVIEWS

## CONGRESS OF CLASSICAL STUDIES, 1954

*Acta Congressus Madvigiani* (Proceedings of the Second International Congress of Classical Studies, 1954): *The Classical Pattern of Modern Western Civilization*.

- (1) Vol. i: *Formation of the Mind, Forms of Thought, Moral Ideas*. Pp. 225. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1958. Paper, Kr. 35.
- (2) Vol. iii: *Portraiture*. Pp. 99; 32 figs. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1957. Paper, Kr. 25.
- (3) Vol. v: *Language*. Pp. 235. Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog og Kulturförslag, 1957. Paper, Kr. 35.

(1) *THIS biblion abiblion* consists of a number of 'basic papers' written under a collective title obviously too wide to impose any sort of unity, followed by a review of five of them—oddly called four in its title—from the point of view of an Indian. The papers are intended to fall under the general themes of the Congress, but several are straightforward essays on classical topics with a passing nod to modern civilization at the end.

This does not apply to the first one by Marrou, which vigorously asserts the permeation of modern civilization by Greek ideas. But there is something in the criticism of B. L. Atreya, that it may be superficial to cite as examples of perpetuation of the Greek spirit certain French plays with classical titles or themes, some of which strike him as very un-Greek.

T. B. L. Webster provides a characteristically lively and interesting discussion of the transition from mythical to rational ways of thought in ancient Greece itself, and Bruno Snell, equally characteristically, makes a moving plea that all who value the Greek tradition must be active in defence of freedom of thought: the legacy of Greece is 'die Entwicklung der freien Wissenschaft'. But did Atreya have some passages of this paper in mind when he remarked on the danger in which classical scholars stand of over-idealizing the subject of their study?

Van Groningen, in a long paper on Greek moral ideas, takes them one by one and simply outlines their history from the beginning to the Neoplatonists. He insists that in spite of internal variety 'il a existé une mentalité grecque et une morale grecque', and sees the latter as essentially eudaemonistic. The paper



repeats much that is common knowledge. We meet the Greek horror of 'tout ce qui était vague, indéterminé et informe' ('the fantastic, vague and shapeless' were E. Fraenkel's words in 1935) and their love of the mean, seen as reaction against a natural violence of passion and desires. Do we really need to be reminded that the Greek was Dionysiac as well as Apolline? In repeating yet once more that beauty, morality, and order were closely related in the Greek mind, the writer describes the equation of *καλόν* with *ἀγαθόν* as a borrowing of aesthetic terms, a metaphor 'toute vivante' (p. 82). This is surely misleading: was *καλόν* ever a purely aesthetic term? On p. 87 Socrates' reference to his sons in the *Apology* is used to illustrate general custom, as evidence that family relations were unemotionally taken for granted; but Socrates is hardly represented as typical. Only the *Ethics* is cited for Aristotle's doctrine of the *ψυχή* in a discussion of a hierarchy of the faculties, which is therefore treated without reference to the *δυνάμεις* of the soul as described in *De anima*. On p. 121 it is said that in general Greek morality sees in the non-rational forces only adversaries to be reduced to powerlessness and silence, instead of being organically integrated with the personality. I should have thought that the *Phaedrus* and *Symposium*, indeed the whole Platonic doctrine of *έρως*, formed a rather large and important exception to this.

Festugière's article on the three lives is also an historical *aperçu* of the development of this concept in Greek thought. He agrees (132 f.) with Jaeger that the statement of it attributed to Pythagoras by Heraclides is in fact Academic and not Pythagorean, without noting the sensible arguments to the contrary of A. Cameron in *The Pythagorean Background to the Theory of Recollection* (1938), pp. 29-36. These show, I think, that it is much more likely to be Pythagorean than not.

After a brief note by F. Wehrli on human responsibility in archaic poetry, we have two papers by writers from other disciplines. Hadley Cantril in his first paragraph expresses a desire to bring classical scholars and psychologists closer together, but unfortunately he writes in a jargon calculated to set the scholar's teeth on edge. This is not snobbishness: the English language has its rights, and the scholar by his training is sensitive (or as Mr. Cantril would say 'sensitized') to these rights, of which he is the natural and proper guardian. Arnold M. Rose, on the other hand, packs a great deal of clear thought and expression into five pages. We talk so easily of classical influences in the modern world, and it is salutary to be told that the problem of determining the origin and cause of a particular aspect of non-material culture is so complex and full of difficulties as to be almost insoluble. Having issued his warning, he nevertheless ventures what he calls 'a few biased observations' on the relations between ancient and modern moral ideas, in which he suggests that the influence of Hebrew-Christian values has received less than its due. This short paper and the criticisms of Professor Atreya contain much that the classical scholar should heed, though some English friend might surely have done Atreya the slight service of revising his expression: it is occasionally so unusual as to put his meaning in doubt.

These comments may sound liverish, but the fact is that the collection as a whole raises in an acute form the problem of communication. What is the point of requiring a scholar of the high calibre and originality of Professor van Groningen to spend time in compiling a general survey full of ideas and information intrinsically valuable, but for the most part familiar and even

commonplace to his fellow scholars? Its effect outside the classical world might be considerable, but this trilingual *mélange* is most unlikely to be read by more than a very few who are not professional scholars. The organizers of future conferences might do well to consider whether they ought not either to plan a programme for the mutual instruction and delight of the scholars who attend, or else to take seriously in hand the difficult problem of how to convey the views of scholars on wide general questions to a world which certainly stands in need of them.

Downing College, Cambridge

W. K. C. GUTHRIE

(2) This volume consists of five lectures. In the case of the first three, the contributions made by various speakers to the ensuing discussion are reported. Almost half the space is occupied by two somewhat inconclusive papers by B. Schweitzer on Greek portrait-art, its problems and the present state of research, and on the significance and origin of the portrait among the Greeks. As defined by Schweitzer, a portrait (*εἰκών*), as distinct from any other image (*ἄγαλμα*), must (1) represent a real person, living or dead; (2) do so in such a way that the person could not be mistaken for someone else; (3) give exterior, visual expression to the subject's inner personality. In archaic and earlier classical Greece the more or less naturalistic rendering of 'abnormal' persons—Centaurs, Satyrs, barbarians, etc., the votive statue, the hero-statue, the honorific statue, and the funerary statue or relief all prepared the way for portraiture, the birth of which among the Greeks Schweitzer places in the last quarter of the fifth century B.C. But, as he himself admits, this dating cannot be supported by monumental evidence: he merely *infers* it from what is known about the general growth of individualism at this time in many aspects of Hellenic life. It is, in fact, only with the portraits of Alexander by Lysippus and of Demosthenes by Polyectus (c. 280 B.C.) that literary records and monuments combine to demonstrate that portraits, in the true sense, of particular individuals were made at a certain time. According to Schweitzer, the famous herm of Themistocles at Ostia is a Roman copy of a true portrait of the statesman set up in the Athenian Prytaneion in the early fourth century B.C. But we have no proof at all that the portrait which Pausanias saw there in the second century A.D. really was erected so early: it could have been a product of the historically minded late-Hellenistic period. Again, how do we know that the representation of Pythagoras on coins of Abdera of 432 B.C. was not to a large extent, if not wholly, imaginary; or that the image of the satrap Tissaphernes on the coin of 412/11 B.C., cited in the discussion by W. Schwabacher, was not just a Greek artist's rendering of an 'ethnic' type?

It was in the Hellenistic age that the true Greek portrait was born; and as O. Vessberg clearly and concisely argues in the third lecture, veristic iconography in Rome represents a local school of late-Hellenistic realistic portrait-art developed there by immigrant Greek artists—a late-Hellenistic realistic portrait-art that is evidenced by veristic works (which Vessberg's critics in the following discussion fail to emphasize) such as the Delos portrait-statues of Italian subjects, the very ugly old man from Delos [not from Athens] (E. Buschor, *Das hellenistische Bildnis*, 1941, fig. 43), the priest from the Athenian Agora (*ibid.*, fig. 44), and many of the Hellenistic royal coin-portraits. Again, the coin-portraits of Antony and Cleopatra issued at Antioch-on-the-Orontes, which are quoted in

the discussion by J. Charbonneaux as examples of Roman verism, were, after all, struck in a Hellenistic city, with Greek legends, and designed by Hellenistic craftsmen. F. de Ruyt's attempt in the discussion to trace veristic portraiture back to the art of sixth-century B.C. Etruria is not convincing; and the Roman realistic funerary masks described by Polybius, to which he calls attention, date from the mid-second century B.C., when Hellenistic artists were already establishing their studios in Rome. Roman taste, Roman social customs, and Roman religious tradition most certainly played an important role in the formation in the capital of the local Hellenistic iconographic school, whose works can be described, in that sense, as works of Roman art. But as a clear indication of the fertilizing source without which that art could never have been created, the Greek nationality of Roman-age artists has a far more fundamental significance than de Ruyt would attribute to it.

In the fourth lecture on 'the antique origin of the medieval portrait' H. P. L'Orange contributes an eloquent, not to say moving, exposition of the development of Roman portrait-art during the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. Starting with the 'drastic', 'snapshot'-like realism of the iconography of Maximinus Thrax, Philippus Arabs, and Traianus Decius, he takes us through the 'abstract', 'expressionistic' likenesses of the period between the death of Gallienus and that of Diocletian, and concludes with the mask-like, spiritualized, 'visionary' countenances that characterize the portraiture of the age of Constantine the Great and his successors to c. 500. The final lecture, by E. K. Sass, gives a valuable account, of no little interest to classical archaeologists, of the classical tradition in later European portraiture, with special regard to Thorvaldsen's portraits.

*Newnham College, Cambridge*

J. M. C. TOYNBEE

(3) This book—which is also volume xi of the *Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Copenhague*—is the fruit of a co-operation the reason for which is explained in the Preface. To estimate the influence of classical culture on the linguistic as well as on other aspects of the European tradition is a task less for classical scholars than for specialists in medieval and modern studies, whose contributions accordingly outnumber those of their classical colleagues.

P. Chantraine, in an article none the less valuable for being misnamed 'Le Grec et la structure des langues modernes de l'Occident', reviews those features of Greek which make it specially apt for abstract and intellectual expression, and displays in their early simplicity the main outlines of the classical linguistic pattern. F. Blatt, in a study of Latin influence on European syntax, deals with questions of method and principle as well as discussing particular cases; he emphasizes the importance of three aspects, geographical, stylistic, and historical, in evaluating Latin syntactical influence, and finds it directed towards greater clarity and logicity of expression. W. Betz contributes a short 'programmatic' note on types of influence in the field of vocabulary. G. Devoto discusses many aspects of the survival of Latin features in modern languages, and among them stresses the distinction between survival as continuity of use in the spoken language from Latin onward, which, so far from indicating Latin influence, constitutes an 'anti-Latin' element in the history of a language, and on the other hand survival as the adoption of Latin words, forms, and constructions which had disappeared, or had never been current, in colloquial usage;

this type of survival alone signifies a recourse to literary Latin and a submission to its influence on the part of the vernacular. This point of view is relevant not only to the Romance languages, but in a modified form also to certain non-Romance languages subjected to Latin influence from an early date. The papers of P. Nykrog and K. Sørensen dealing with Latin influence on the syntax of French and English respectively are richly illustrated with examples (the latter is also provided with a bibliography) and show similarities of treatment. From both emerges the contrast of two general effects of Latin influence, one beneficial, stimulating in the native language the development of complex sentence-structure together with a clarifying and regularizing of its syntax, the other harmful, arising from excessive imitation of Latin syntax and the banning (especially in English) of such native constructions as have no counterpart in Latin. Between these two studies come papers by A. Lombard and L. L. Hammerich. The former writes on the fusion of Latin and Slavonic elements in Rumanian, which has undergone considerable re-Latinization in comparatively recent times; read with Devoto's contribution in mind, this article seems to reveal Rumanian as a special case of the contrast between the two types of Latin tradition in Romance. Hammerich, in his *Germanistic Reflexions on Antique After-effects on European Culture* gives, not a systematic treatment, but a number of interesting and sometimes provocative observations on Latin influence in Germanic. In particular he utters a forthright condemnation of the reintroduction of Ciceronian Latin by Renaissance writers, since this, by making impossible the natural expression of contemporary political and scientific ideas in Latin, 'destroyed the linguistic community based on Latin'. He does not add, however, that the abandonment of Latin for practical ends has made possible the use of *classical* Latin as an aesthetic and intellectual exercise, deriving its value from the contrasts as much as from the correspondences between modern and ancient forms of expression. A. Sommerfelt's contribution on Latin influence in the Insular Celtic languages is informative, but too short. In his list of Latin words borrowed by the British languages he does not seek to make the important distinction between the traces of everyday bilingualism during the Roman occupation of Britain (corresponding to Devoto's 'uninterrupted tradition' in Romance) and loans from various forms of literary Latin (the 'interrupted tradition'). If Celtic has too small a place, Hungarian and Finnish virtually none, Slavonic in contrast receives a noble share in the shape of a treatise of over fifty pages, complete with preface and conclusions and full enough to have deserved an index, by A. Stender-Petersen and K. Jordal, on 'Das griechisch-byzantinische Erbe im Russischen'. This contribution is of particular interest in that it alone describes a case of Greek influence, an influence partly direct and partly, in so far as it is not direct, transmitted not through Latin, but through Church Slavonic. The general similarity in effect between Greek and Latin linguistic influence confirms the point made particularly by Devoto, that behind the Latin pattern stands Greek, and brings the reader back to Chantraine's masterly exposition of the basic Greek patterns in the first article. Finally, Chantraine and Blatt present further observations on their respective subjects in the light of the other contributions.

Certain defects, as the preface in part admits, are inseparable from a book of this kind. The field of study is unevenly covered. Some contributions are systematic reviews and studies, others consist of notes and comments; some seem to be prolegomena to a discussion, others part of the discussion. Even so,

the reader may glimpse, reflected in these various facets, a linguistic type common to all European languages and imposing its form on their separate vocabularies, morphological and syntactical structures; a unity now probably emancipated from its classical origins and capable of existence and development without further recourse to them, but still clearly showing the classical linguistic pattern in which it was created.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## TABLETS FROM MYCENAE AND PYLOS

(1) EMMETT L. BENNETT and others: *The Mycenae Tablets, II.* (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 48, pt. 1.) Pp. 122; 58 pages of plans, photographs, drawings. Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1958. Paper, \$3.

(2) EMMETT L. BENNETT: *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos: Texts of Inscriptions found, 1955.* (*Minos*, Supplementos 2.) Pp. ii+66; 19 plates. Salamanca: Universidad, 1958. Paper.

[In this review the Linear B script is represented by Ventris's phonetic transcription. This has been done for typographical convenience; in the reviewer's opinion, the transcription has no intrinsic value].<sup>1</sup>

(1) Pp. 1-44 describe the excavation of inscribed tablets at Mycenae in 1952, 1953, and 1954. There is a detailed account by the late Professor Wace of the 'House of Shields' and 'House of the Oil Merchant'; and Miss Elizabeth Wace has added a section on the 'House of Sphinxes'. Thirty pages of plans and photographs illustrate the site and the chief archaeological discoveries. To the reviewer this part of the book seems admirably clear and complete. Everyone who reads it must feel satisfaction that in these three summers Wace crowned his career at Mycenae by finding the first substantial quantity of written documents from that city.

The rest of the book (pp. 45-122) deals with the tablets, as well as with vase-inscriptions and seal-impressions found at various times. Apart from a short section by Mr. Chadwick, entitled 'Translations and Linguistic Commentary' (pp. 106-12), all this comes from Dr. Bennett. There is first a catalogue of all the documents, and then photographs of the tablets and of some vase-inscriptions. The tablets are also shown in facsimile drawings made from traces, as are the remaining marks on vases. Next comes Bennett's evaluation of the text, which he presents both in the original script and in 'deciphered' form. Finally, in an 'Epigraphic Commentary', the author distinguishes the hands of six scribes and discusses his interpretation of several ideograms, including quantitative symbols.

*The Pylos Tablets* (1951, 1955) revealed Bennett's capabilities as an editor; he is conscientious to a degree in arranging and copying texts, listing individual signs, and compiling vocabularies, and he is skilful in filling in parts of the texts which are partly or wholly obliterated. But these earlier publications also laid

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller discussion of matters dealt with in this review see also *Festschrift für Johannes Sundwall*, Berlin, 1958, pp. 1-34 and

*Mittl. des Inst. für Orientforsch.*, Berlin, vi. 1 (1958), pp. 33-104.



this type of survival alone signifies a recourse to literary Latin and a submission to its influence on the part of the vernacular. This point of view is relevant not only to the Romance languages, but in a modified form also to certain non-Romance languages subjected to Latin influence from an early date. The papers of P. Nykrog and K. Sørensen dealing with Latin influence on the syntax of French and English respectively are richly illustrated with examples (the latter is also provided with a bibliography) and show similarities of treatment. From both emerges the contrast of two general effects of Latin influence, one beneficial, stimulating in the native language the development of complex sentence-structure together with a clarifying and regularizing of its syntax, the other harmful, arising from excessive imitation of Latin syntax and the banning (especially in English) of such native constructions as have no counterpart in Latin. Between these two studies come papers by A. Lombard and L. L. Hammerich. The former writes on the fusion of Latin and Slavonic elements in Rumanian, which has undergone considerable re-Latinization in comparatively recent times; read with Devoto's contribution in mind, this article seems to reveal Rumanian as a special case of the contrast between the two types of Latin tradition in Romance. Hammerich, in his *Germanistic Reflexions on Antique After-effects on European Culture* gives, not a systematic treatment, but a number of interesting and sometimes provocative observations on Latin influence in Germanic. In particular he utters a forthright condemnation of the reintroduction of Ciceronian Latin by Renaissance writers, since this, by making impossible the natural expression of contemporary political and scientific ideas in Latin, 'destroyed the linguistic community based on Latin'. He does not add, however, that the abandonment of Latin for practical ends has made possible the use of *classical* Latin as an aesthetic and intellectual exercise, deriving its value from the contrasts as much as from the correspondences between modern and ancient forms of expression. A. Sommerfelt's contribution on Latin influence in the Insular Celtic languages is informative, but too short. In his list of Latin words borrowed by the British languages he does not seek to make the important distinction between the traces of everyday bilingualism during the Roman occupation of Britain (corresponding to Devoto's 'uninterrupted tradition' in Romance) and loans from various forms of literary Latin (the 'interrupted tradition'). If Celtic has too small a place, Hungarian and Finnish virtually none, Slavonic in contrast receives a noble share in the shape of a treatise of over fifty pages, complete with preface and conclusions and full enough to have deserved an index, by A. Stender-Petersen and K. Jordal, on 'Das griechisch-byzantinische Erbe im Russischen'. This contribution is of particular interest in that it alone describes a case of Greek influence, an influence partly direct and partly, in so far as it is not direct, transmitted not through Latin, but through Church Slavonic. The general similarity in effect between Greek and Latin linguistic influence confirms the point made particularly by Devoto, that behind the Latin pattern stands Greek, and brings the reader back to Chantraine's masterly exposition of the basic Greek patterns in the first article. Finally, Chantraine and Blatt present further observations on their respective subjects in the light of the other contributions.

Certain defects, as the preface in part admits, are inseparable from a book of this kind. The field of study is unevenly covered. Some contributions are systematic reviews and studies, others consist of notes and comments; some seem to be prolegomena to a discussion, others part of the discussion. Even so,

the reader may glimpse, reflected in these various facets, a linguistic type common to all European languages and imposing its form on their separate vocabularies, morphological and syntactical structures; a unity now probably emancipated from its classical origins and capable of existence and development without further recourse to them, but still clearly showing the classical linguistic pattern in which it was created.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## TABLETS FROM MYCENAE AND PYLOS

(1) EMMETT L. BENNETT and others: *The Mycenae Tablets, II.* (*Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, vol. 48, pt. 1.) Pp. 122; 58 pages of plans, photographs, drawings. Philadelphia, American Philosophical Society, 1958. Paper, \$3.

(2) EMMETT L. BENNETT: *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos: Texts of Inscriptions found, 1955.* (*Minos*, Supplementos 2.) Pp. ii+66; 19 plates. Salamanca: Universidad, 1958. Paper.

[In this review the Linear B script is represented by Ventris's phonetic transcription. This has been done for typographical convenience; in the reviewer's opinion, the transcription has no intrinsic value].<sup>1</sup>

(1) Pp. 1-44 describe the excavation of inscribed tablets at Mycenae in 1952, 1953, and 1954. There is a detailed account by the late Professor Wace of the 'House of Shields' and 'House of the Oil Merchant'; and Miss Elizabeth Wace has added a section on the 'House of Sphinxes'. Thirty pages of plans and photographs illustrate the site and the chief archaeological discoveries. To the reviewer this part of the book seems admirably clear and complete. Everyone who reads it must feel satisfaction that in these three summers Wace crowned his career at Mycenae by finding the first substantial quantity of written documents from that city.

The rest of the book (pp. 45-122) deals with the tablets, as well as with vase-inscriptions and seal-impressions found at various times. Apart from a short section by Mr. Chadwick, entitled 'Translations and Linguistic Commentary' (pp. 106-12), all this comes from Dr. Bennett. There is first a catalogue of all the documents, and then photographs of the tablets and of some vase-inscriptions. The tablets are also shown in facsimile drawings made from traces, as are the remaining marks on vases. Next comes Bennett's evaluation of the text, which he presents both in the original script and in 'deciphered' form. Finally, in an 'Epigraphic Commentary', the author distinguishes the hands of six scribes and discusses his interpretation of several ideograms, including quantitative symbols.

*The Pylos Tablets* (1951, 1955) revealed Bennett's capabilities as an editor; he is conscientious to a degree in arranging and copying texts, listing individual signs, and compiling vocabularies, and he is skilful in filling in parts of the texts which are partly or wholly obliterated. But these earlier publications also laid

<sup>1</sup> For a fuller discussion of matters dealt with in this review see also *Festschrift für Johannes Sundwall*, Berlin, 1958, pp. 1-34 and

*Mittl. des Inst. für Orientalforschung*, Berlin, vi. 1 (1958), pp. 33-104.

bare his deficiencies; he is sometimes rash in joining fragments together, and his supplements often depend on analogies which are unjustified. For example, by reading *qe-to-ro-po-pi* in Pylos Ae 134, where he should have read *qe-to-ro-po-ra*, and by imposing this word on other fragmentary texts, he deluded Ventris into the belief that he had discovered references to 'four-footed' animals; and the consequences have been lamentable. Again, by interpreting the obliterated ideogram of Pylos Sh 736 as a 'breast-plate', he caused many people to imagine that the word *to-ra-ke* in this text is confirmed by the ideogram to be the Greek word for 'breast-plates'. So we may approach this new edition with mingled hope and fear. Fortunately, the photographs and drawings which Bennett provides so lavishly enable us to test the accuracy of his interpretations.

Bennett's text of Ge 605, 605a—one of the 'spice' tablets—is as follows. Lacunae and doubtful syllables are given as indicated by him on p. 82; parts of the text which are italicized here appear from the facsimile on p. 71 not to be clearly legible or to be entirely invisible.

Ge 605, 605a

- 1 Pe-*ṣṣ*-ro  
[ ]ka-na-ko LB2[ ]ka-]*ṣṣ*-*ḳḳ* [ ]
- 2 Pu<sub>2</sub>-ke  
[ka-na-ko]e-ru-ta-ra LB3 ka-na-ko re-u-ka QT1 ma[-ra-tu-wo mi]-ta PE1 ṣṣ-[pi-de  
*ḳḳ*-*ṣṣ*-[ja-da]-*ṣṣ* DM2 ku-mi-na QT1 sa-sa-[ma ]*ḳḳ* 14]
- 3 Pe-ke-u  
ka-na-ko e-ru-[ta-ra ka]-na-ko re-[-*u*ka] PT2 [ ]  
ko-ri-ja-da-na DM2[ ku]-mi-*ṣṣ* PT[*ṣṣ*]
- 4 Ka-e-*ṣṣ*-u  
ka-na-ko e-ru-ta-ra LB2 DR1 ka-na-ko re-u-[ka  
ko-ri-a<sub>2</sub>-da-na DM2 ku-mi-no PT[*ṣṣ*]
- 5 Ke-po  
ko-ri-a<sub>2</sub>-da-na DM2 CUP 1
- 6 I-na-o  
ku-mi-no PT2 ka-ra-*ḳḳ*[ ]ṣṣ-pi-de 12  
ka-na-ko re-u-ka[ ]sa-sa-ma PT2 mi-ta PE1
- 1 Pe-*ṣṣ*-ro: pe-qo[ V ]*ṣṣ*-*ḳḳ*: ]-na V  
2 Pu<sub>2</sub>-ke: Na-ke V ]*ḳḳ*: vel]-te B

Obviously the differences between the two versions are considerable; and the photograph on p. 70 proves that the facsimile is more reliable than the transcribed text. Some of the faults in the latter are probably due to careless printing. For example, the *mi* of ku]-*mi*-no in l. 3b is obliterated and should be within the bracket, and the ideogram following it is probably obscured as well; similarly the *u* of re-u-[ka in l. 4a occurs at a point where the clay is broken off and not merely defaced. In these and other cases, notably the *ḳḳ*-*ṣṣ*-[ja-da]-*ṣṣ* of l. 2b, where virtually nothing is to be seen on the photograph, Bennett has written down not what he saw but what he thought should be there. That is to say, he uses the repetitive formulae which occur in the surviving portion of this text—and in the three complete texts and two fragments which make up the rest of the Ge series—to fill in gaps. It is possible that all his supplements are correct; but anyone familiar with Linear B texts will realize that the procedure is perilous. Suppose that in the Pylos Ta series one or two instances of *to-pe-za* had survived and in addition only the fragments *to-pe*[ and ]*pe-za*; in such a case Bennett would have supplied *to-pe-za* everywhere, overlooking the



possibility of *to-pe-zo* and *we-pe-za*, which are in fact preserved in that series. So in the Ge series, it is imprudent to read ]no as *ku-mi-no*, ignoring *se-ri-no*, or ]ko[ as *ka-ra-ko*, ignoring both *ko-ri-ja-da-na* and *ka-na-ko*; the formulae are not well enough established. The example of Ge 605 demonstrates—in a fairly harmless way—that Bennett's texts are too venturesome to be used without reference to his photographs and drawings.

Fo 101 provides another, and more serious, instance of Bennett's carelessness. On p. 79 he renders ideogram 130, which occurs in l. 15 of this text, as 'oil'. It is only on p. 96 that he remarks in passing, and without explanation, that 130 is here differentiated by a superimposed sign, which may be *we*. In *M.T.I* he had suggested that 130 might signify either 'oil' or 'a measure of oil'; and he now says that this suggestion has been generally accepted and that the reasons for it need not be repeated. In fact, the argument put forward in *M.T.I* is quite trivial, both in whole and in part; and the real reason for the general acceptance of Bennett's suggestion is that within a few months of its being published it appeared to be confirmed by the discovery of Pylos Gn 1184, which contains both 130 and the word *e-ra<sub>3</sub>-wo*. (Since then, five other texts have been found showing the same combination, and one with 130 and *e-ra-wo*; needless to say, however, there are many examples of 130 without either of these words.)

Now the peculiarity of Gn 1184 is that it has been held to confirm not only the meaning of 130 but also Ventris's equation  $33 = ra_3$ , which otherwise rests on the dubious *pi-je-ra<sub>3</sub>*. This valuable text came to light very promptly on 4 July 1954 soon after the publication of *M.T.I*; but even more curious is the fact that A. Furumark declared himself almost convinced (by some unknown authority) that 130 must signify 'oil' at the very time when Bennett was putting forward this suggestion quite tentatively. Bennett is mistaken; his identification of 130 still requires proof, and mere repetition of the reasons given in *M.T.I* will not suffice.

The Oe tablets are characterized by ideogram 145, which on pp. 83–86 Bennett confidently renders 'wool'. Only when we read pp. 97–99 do we discover that he has no idea whether it means 'wool' or not. He does not on this occasion omit discussion; but, after copious citation of hypothetical weights and measures, it turns out that he has forgotten the one substantial pretext for the value 'wool'—namely, that 145 occurs not infrequently in contexts which Ventris had chosen to associate with 'cloth' (*pa-we-a<sub>2</sub>*). Desperately Bennett concludes: 'A satisfactory solution of its meaning seems still remote, but we might ask these questions about it. Does WOOL always represent the same commodity? Does it always represent a measure of weight, and is its relation to the LB used with other ideograms correctly determined? Can it represent a commodity in raw state, in bulk, and at another time represent that commodity as the material of which an object named in the accounts is made? Is the commodity represented by WOOL actually wool, and if so, what state is meant if the sign is not qualified by a description; i.e. does it stand for fleeces, sheared wool, yarn or cloth?' It is doubtful whether many people will wish to ask *these* questions.

Ventris's decipherment has given rise to a new kind of linguistic commentary. To explain or defend any deciphered word it is thought sufficient to produce a parallel instance—very often one suffices. The search extends to all varieties of classical and post-classical Greek, and even to medieval and modern Greek; established rules of sound-change and word-formation are relaxed, and

attention is seldom paid to semantic accuracy. When several conflicting explanations are found and none of them seems very plausible, it is usual to set them out side by side, on the assumption that the required solution may be somewhere amongst them. In extreme cases, when no 'parallel' presents itself, the commentator is content to compare the unintelligible word with other unintelligible words in the Linear B corpus; or in the last resort he emends the text. Of this 'method' Mr. Chadwick is the chief architect and the chief exponent.

Chadwick reaches the end of his tether in this book when he accuses the scribe of Ge 602 of writing *pu-ke pe-ro-ro* instead of *pu-ke-o o-pe-ro* and when he quotes, without apparent revulsion, Bennett's suggestion that in Ge 604 *ke-e-pe* might be a mistake for *ke-pe-e* and so an irregular dative of *ke-po*—a neuter personal name of the third declension! Elsewhere Chadwick finds enough 'parallels' to content him and passes happily on the way, seemingly unconscious of his plight.

The two Au tablets show how serious that plight is. Here the word *a-to-po-go* at Au 102. 14 has been identified with a dubious word for 'bakers', and it is assumed that all the other one-word entries in both tablets will be the names of bakers. In Au 102 *i-o* and *e-u-po-ro* can obviously be interpreted as personal names, and so can *ka-ri-se-u* and *e-ke-ne*, provided that we do not examine their formation too closely. But we are then left with upwards of a dozen 'names' in Au 102 and 609, which have no explanation in terms of the Greek language; and, to cap all, we find a 'baker' called *ke-re-no* accompanied by the numeral 2 and another called *o-ri-ko*, with the numeral 3. To most people it is obvious that the initial hypothesis has collapsed long before we reach the 'two-fold' and 'three-fold bakers'; the notion that we have in these texts a list of bakers is childish simple and also wrong. Chadwick, however, is undismayed. He writes of *o-ri-ko* as follows: 'For the latter a name, *Oligōn* or the like, is conceivable; or it may be an occupational term, though Meriggi's *orikoi* "muleteers" will hardly do if *οὔρεϋς* is derived from *ὄρος* (*hórfos* perhaps dissimilated from *φόρφος* which may be represented by Myc. *wo-wo*). The interpretation *oligoi* does not give satisfactory sense, unless we can accept the suggestion of Hampe . . . that it means "individuals", i.e. "others".' I am unable to discover any positive sense in this statement.

Of all the tablets found at Mycenae, the Ge or 'spice' tablets have the greatest impact on the decipherment. As early as June 1952 (*Worknote 20*), Ventris had postulated *ko-ri-ja-do-no*, *ko-ri-a<sub>2</sub>-da-na* as equivalent to 'coriander'. The Ge tablets, excavated a year later, gave further examples of *ko-ri-a<sub>2</sub>-da-na* and of a new variant *ko-ri-ja-da-na* and, alongside them, the words *ku-mi-no/na*, *sa-sa-ma*, which might represent oriental seeds, and a number of other words resembling Greek plant-names. *Ka-na-ko* is apparently parallel to *κηκός*, safflower, a dye-producing plant; *mi-ta* and *se-ri-no* recall *μίνθα* and *σέλινον*. From this point the 'parallels' become less satisfactory; *ka-da-mi-ja* (or *ka-da-mi-ta*?) is not likely to be either *καλάμινθα* or *\*καρδάμια*; *ko-no* and *ko-i-no* are less than convincing as the equivalent of a rare perfumed rush from Syria (*σχοῖνος*); as an indication of *γλήχων*, the syllables *ka-ra-ko* are unimpressive; and *ma-ra-tu-wo* will not match either *μάραθρον* or *μάραθρον*. Finally, there is a number of words which cannot be given any botanical significance—*sa-pi-de*, *e-ne-me-na*, *a-po-te-i*, *pe-se-ro*, as well as questionable introductory formulae and 'personal names'. The pattern of these texts is generally similar to that of the Au tablets; but in the Ge series the proportion of Greek words identified is

much higher, and the semantic connexion between them is much more attractive. Ventris had certainly an excuse for supposing that here at last he had proof of his decipherment at arm's length.

Nevertheless his hopes were vain. The 'House of Sphinxes' was searched for spices (cf. p. 12). No coriander, cumin, sesame, or safflower was found, nor any of the native seeds identified by Ventris, but only vetches, lentils, and perhaps some grass peas. It would in any case be surprising if coriander, cumin, and sesame had been available in Levantine ports during the thirteenth century for export to Mycenae; safflower could have been obtained, but it would have been valued as a dye.<sup>1</sup> But if any of these seeds had been brought to Mycenae, it is inconceivable that they would have been stored and measured along with native seeds which must have been available locally in large quantities, whether cultivated or grown wild. There is no botanical or economic sense in Chadwick's interpretation of the spices. It might have been more prudent on his part to insist on the four oriental varieties and to abandon the rest; but this would of course have involved the admission that nine-tenths of the texts were unintelligible.

But the crux lies, as always, in the deciphered words and syllables. We have before us four words that are easily reconcilable with the Greek names of oriental seeds, and half a dozen more that can with difficulty be matched with plant-names native to Greece. The combination is impressive enough, but it can be explained simply, and without recourse to Chadwick's account. There are in Greek hundreds of plant-names of the first and second declensions and of two or three syllables, the suffixes *ko/kā*, *no/nā*, *mo/mā*, *to/tā* being common amongst them. Ventris gave these values, in somewhat haphazard fashion, to signs which are common at the end of Linear B words. Rather infrequently it happens that his identifications ultimately produce whole words that are reconcilable with known Greek words of one period or another. Very rarely two or more words in the same context are semantically related to each other. The Ge series is unique in providing the appearance of four or more words of kindred meaning. But this is surely a fluke, as is evident both from the uniqueness of the phenomenon in the Linear B corpus and from the botanical and economic absurdity of the resulting interpretation. Examination of other words in the corpus which begin with the syllabic groups *ka-na-*, *ka-ra-*, *ko-ri-*, *ma-ra-*, *sa-sa-*, etc., reinforce this conclusion; nearly all such words are unintelligible by any standard. If Chadwick had carried his inquiries into Greek plants beyond cursory and incomplete references to Theophrastus, Dioscorides, and Hesychius, and if he had paused to reflect on the negative effect of words which do not make sense in their deciphered form, one might take a relatively charitable view of his opinions; but he does none of these things.

To sum up, the archaeological introduction to the book is an excellent and indeed indispensable record. Bennett's treatment of the texts is on the whole praiseworthy; but it is full of minor inaccuracies, and his evaluation of ideograms, etc., is quite unreliable. Chadwick's 'Commentary' is not to be taken very seriously.

(2) Dr. Bennett has been known hitherto as the first editor of the texts from Pylos and Mycenae. He now appears not only as editor but also as interpreter.

<sup>1</sup> It is not a seasoning for Dioscorides, as taken in medical concoctions or added to food. Chadwick thinks, but a purge which can be

He has grouped together sixty Pylian texts, one of them from the 1939 finds, five from 1954, and the rest from 1955. All but two of them (343, 1184) are published in full for the first time. All are short, and few are complete.

The texts are presented according to Bennett's usual method. There are photographs and drawings (pls. ii-xix) of all the tablets except two unimportant fragments. Then follow Bennett's own renderings, both in the original signary and in the Ventris transcription (pp. 39-68). The photographs are good, and the drawings have been done with care. Unhappily, Bennett's draughtsmanship is sometimes influenced by his ideas about interpretation. He is apt to represent as part of signs and ideograms marks which, to judge by the photographs, are cracks and breaks on the clay-surface. It is true that some accidental fissures do follow lines made by the scribes (e.g. 1213, *ne*; 1203, *do*); but Bennett's restorations are often adventurous (e.g. 1202, *wo* in *me-tu-wo*; 1220, *wa*, *na* in *wa-na-ka-te*). Even when the inscribed surface is virtually intact, the drawing may suggest more than can be seen (e.g. 1205, *a-pi-qo-ro-i*, where the *pi* is admitted to be more like a *ti*; or 1184, where the ideogram on the photograph is less impressive than Bennett's representation of it as 130 'olive-oil'). On other occasions the drawing shows less than the eye can discern, notably in 1223 *e-ra-wo*, where the photograph makes *pi-ra-wo* certain; the inner vertical stroke of *pi* has been toned down. In several instances of doubtful copying, Bennett's version is found to be the basis of his interpretation. It is a pity that he has not himself seen the 1955 tablets but relies on photographs and on readings supplied by others.

The rendering of the drawings into the Ventris transcription is on the whole good but not free from faults. In the marking of lacunae by brackets, the pointing of partly defaced signs, the insertion or omission of the word-divider, Bennett displays more confidence than the facts warrant. His long experience of the Linear B documents perhaps entitles him to restore where others would confess ignorance or at least doubt, and there are certainly places where a damaged sign seems to admit only one conjecture. Nevertheless, Bennett ought to mark *all* defective signs with a point and enclose them within brackets. For example, 1198 appears in this collection because he finds in it a monogram of *a*, *ro*, and *pa*, making *a-ro-pa* 'unguent'; but too much of the supposed monogram is broken away for it to be read with certainty or even probability. In 1255 *ke-se]-nu-wi-jo* is read and this word is quoted elsewhere as if it were beyond doubt; but even the *nu* is open to question. Similarly the word *to-so*, which is of considerable importance for Bennett's interpretation of 1184, is (like the ideogram 130 mentioned above) some way short of being obvious. It is always necessary to check Bennett's readings in pp. 39-68 against his photographs and drawings.

Questions of interpretation are dealt with partly in a long Introduction (pp. 15-38) and partly in commentaries on the individual texts (pp. 39-68). All the tablets are said to deal with *olive-oil* or *unguents*. Ideogram 130, which is said to mean 'olive-oil', is found (or in some cases is restored) in thirty-nine texts. The other texts are associated with these thirty-nine, either because they have words in common with them (sometimes restored) or because they were found in the same parts of the palace (*not* a sufficient reason). Only six texts contain both 130 and the word *e-ra<sub>3</sub>-wo*, equated with *ἐλαιον*; a seventh is alleged to have 130 and *e-ra-wo* but in fact has *pi-ra-wo* (see above). Only two texts have *a-ro-pa*, equated with *ἀλοιφή*. Altogether, the vocabulary of the

sixty texts amounts to just over 70 words (excluding fragmentary words), and of these some 48 (including about 10 proper names) are identified as 'Greek'. The proper names were mostly known from the discoveries of 1939 and 1952; e.g. *pa-ki-ja-na*, *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo-i*, *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo-jo*, *po-ro-wi-to*, *po-se-da-o-ne*, *po-ti-ni-ja*, *ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro*, *ti-ri-se-ro-e*. Two of these (*po-se-da-o-ne*, *po-ti-ni-ja*) resemble genuine Greek names. Some of the other words were also known before; e.g. *ka-ra-re-we*, *ke-se-nu-wi-jo*, *me-no*, *pa-ro*, *te-i-ja*, *te-o-i*, *to-so*. But most are new. Some can be equated, given Ventris's spelling conventions and phonetic rules, with known Greek words: viz. *wo-do-we*, *ῥοδόφεις*; *we-a-no-i*, *ἑανοῖς*; *wa-na-so-i*, *ἀνάσσου*?, dat. du.; *ma-te-re*, *μητρει*, dat. sing.; *di-pi-si-jo-i*, *διπίους*; *me-tu-wo*, *μέθυσ*?; *ke-se-ni-wi-jo*, *ξείνιον*; *a-pe-do-ke*, *ἀπέδωκε*; *ne-wo*, *νεοῖο*? gen. sing. The rest are unknown in Greek; they are, however, forced into a Greek form, either in whole or in part.

Bennett's starting-point is the double proposition, *e-ra<sub>3</sub>-wo* = 130 = 'olive-oil'. From this it follows that *wo-do-we* must mean 'rose-scented', *pa-ko-we* 'sage-scented', and *ku-pa-ro-we* 'cyperus-scented'. In addition, *e-ti-we* becomes 'eti-scented' and *a-e-ti-to* 'not eti-scented'. All these words are said to be epithets of 'olive-oil'. So too are *we-a-re-pe* and *we-ja-re-pe*, which may mean either 'garment-anointing' (I.E. \**wes-*, 'clothe') or 'foranointing' (Cypr. *ῥ-*, comitative prefix). Into this context is fitted *e-u-me-de-i*, a word which in other Pylian texts is associated with *a-re-pa-zo-o*; and thus emerges 'Eumedes the unguent-boiler'. The oil is measured in odd pints and quarts. It is sent hither and thither across a landscape in which *ro-u-si-jo a-ko-ro*, *Λούσιος ἄγρός*, and *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo a-ko-ro*, *Πακιάνιος* (?) *ἄγρός*, are prominent features; both names were known previously, and the latter is regarded as one of Nestor's 'nine cities'. Other localities, hitherto unknown, are identified by the ending *-de*. So *ti-no-de* is 'to Tinos'? and *pi-jo-de* 'to Pijos'?; Bennett is not quite sure, however, that *e-re-de* is 'to Helos'. The landscape is peopled chiefly with gods. Apart from the unguent-boiler, who is a mortal, there is a king, *wa-na-ka-te* or *wa-na-ke-te*, but he is probably divine. The *wa-na-so-i* are a pair of Divine Queens. *Po-se-da-o-ne* and the still unidentified *po-ti-ni-ja* are found not only in these 'olive-oil' texts but also in the 'bronze' texts and others. Here we have also nameless gods, *te-o-i*, and an anonymous Divine Mother, *ma-te-re te-i-ja*. An interesting group are the 'Thirsty Gods'—*di-pi-si-jo*, *di-pi-si-jo-i*, and the linguistically absurd *di-pi-si-je-wi-jo*. There are festivals, one of which is the *me-tu-wo ne-wo*, an ungrammatical way of saying 'of new wine' [*sic*]. *To-no-e-ke-te-ri-jo* is 'the dragging of the throne', and *re-ke-e-to-ro-te-ri-jo* (also *re-ke-to-ro-te-ri-jo*) is a 'bed-spreading' ceremony. Sometimes the date of the festival is mentioned. Poseidon receives his olive-oil, scented with sage and *eti*, in the *pa-ki-ja-ni-jo-jo me-no*, 'in the month of *Pakijanos*' (*P.* being apparently a god of *Pakijana*); but the Thirsty Gods and the Divine Queens take oil in *po-ro-wi-to*, which is poorish Greek for 'in the month of *Ploistos*'.

Such is Bennett's conception of life at Pylos towards the close of the Mycenaean Age. Professor L. R. Palmer is, broadly speaking, of the same mind (*Trans. Philolog. Soc.*, 1958, pp. 1-35). To explain the religious setting, however, Palmer often has recourse to eastern civilizations. In his opinion there is 'a religious *κωρή* comprising the area from Mesopotamia to Greece and perhaps beyond'. This enables him to explain many things that remain hidden from Bennett. One would of course like to know how this religious *κωρή* is to be related to Palmer's earlier explanation of the 'wheat' tablets, in



the course of which he invoked parallels from the Teutonic peoples, the Hittites, and other sources. Was there a cultural unity—in the widest possible sense—extending from Mesopotamia to the North Sea?

Somewhere between Bennett and Palmer stands Mr. Chadwick—leaning, it appears, towards the former rather than the latter; for Palmer devotes half of his article to disputing Chadwick's opinions, whereas Bennett is apt to quote the Cambridge scholar with approval. In general I have sympathy with Bennett and Chadwick, on the ground that they are at least aware that it is a Greek hypothesis that they are trying to demonstrate. Unlike Palmer, they are occasionally worried by abnormal inflexions and by the absence of inflexion.

At this point, however, my sympathy with Bennett runs out. He shows himself quite incapable of distinguishing between sound argument and wild surmise. His references, whether to Linear B texts or to supporting evidence, are slipshod. He rarely quotes a text in full and on occasion seems to imagine that the glossary at the end of Ventris and Chadwick, *Documents in Mycenaean Greek* (Cambridge, 1956), is adequate proof of any hypothesis. He constructs an enormous edifice of conjecture, piling one idea on top of another without any regard for the ultimate consequences. It is enough to cite his efforts to justify *wo-do-we*, *ku-pa-ro-we*, and *pa-ko-we* as epithets of 'olive-oil'. Of the first he says merely that it is 'parallel in form and meaning to the Homeric *ρόδοφεις*, aptly applied to oil in *Iliad* 23. 186'. He does not say that in the *Iliad* Homer is describing oil applied to Hector's body by Aphrodite; this oil may be imaginary or it may be an extract of roses and its substance and colour (rather than its smell) may be the reason for calling it 'rosy'. For the second epithet, Bennett quotes Theophrastus *de odoribus* 28 τὸ δὲ χρίσμα τὸ Ἑρετρικὸν ἐκ τοῦ κυπείρου: but he does not consider the possibility that an ointment extracted from cyperus may not be evidence for olive-oil scented with cyperus. But it is in the third case that he reaches the limit of absurdity. Having consulted literature ranging from Sibthorp's *Flora Graeca* to the *Oxford English Dictionary* and having examined about twenty species of *Salvia*, he fails to identify a plant that might correspond to the Greek *σάκος* with which he wishes to identify *pa-ko-we*. He then leaps to the conclusion that *σάκος* may be ground-sage (*Salvia officinalis*?) and goes to a grocer's shop to buy some. Next he boils a mixture of olive-oil, ground-sage, and salt in a saucepan and obtains—not surprisingly—a 'clear, light oil, pleasantly (though transiently) scented' (pp. 17–19 fn. 11). We are not told what this experiment in unguent-boiling is supposed to prove. In fact it proves nothing whatever.

Why, after all, should we imagine 1222 to mean 'one quart of sage-scented, clothes-anointing olive-oil to Pakijana for the Throne-dragging (or for the Lamentation-start)'? Why should 1223 signify that two jars of this mysterious fluid are bound for Tinos? What reason can there be for combining phoney Greek, phoney commerce, and phoney religion in this way? The answer is simple. We must believe these things in order that we may continue to believe the Ventris interpretation of 1184. This text runs: *ko-ka-ro a-pe-do-ke e-ra<sub>3</sub>-wo to-so* / *e-u-me-de-i* 130 18 / *pa-ro i-pe-se-wa-ka-ra-re-we*, 38, and is taken to mean: 'Kokalos paid so much oil to Eumedes, 18 (units of) oil. From (to? at?) Ipsewas stirrup-jars, 38.'

On *to-so* and 130 in this text, see above, p. 248. I have shown elsewhere (*Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, vi. 1 [1958], 95 f.) that apart from *e-ra<sub>3</sub>-wo* nothing in 1184 has any particular cogency. The vital question is,

how reliable is the double proposition  $e-ra_3wo = 130 = \text{'olive-oil'}$ ? It is upon this proposition that Bennett chiefly relies in his new essay; but he says no more than that the value of 130 'has for some time been recognised' and that its association with  $e-ra_3wo$  now 'makes clear its identity' (p. 15). Further proof is necessary; for a study of Ventris's methods of decipherment indicates that either the value  $ra_3$  must have been invented in order to complete the equation  $e-xwo = 130 = \text{'olive-oil'}$  or 130 must have been rendered 'olive-oil' in order to complete the equation  $e-ra_3wo = x = \text{'olive-oil'}$ . Bennett would have been well advised to re-state his own arguments about 130 (*A.J.A.* liv [1950], 211 f.; *Proc. Amer. Philos. Soc.* xcvi [1953], 422 f.) before taking the adventurous path which he is now trying to follow.

To sum up, Bennett has given us a moderately accurate, but far from perfect, text of his 'olive-oil' tablets. A good deal of revision is needed to make it an authoritative text. His attempts at interpretation are mere exercises of fancy. They prove, if proof be needed, that Ventris's decipherment only fits the words and phrases for which it was originally designed and that it cannot be applied to a wide range of new materials.

University of Edinburgh

A. J. BEATTIE

## MÉMOIRES DE PHILOGIE MYCÉNIENNE

MICHEL LEJEUNE: *Mémoires de Philologie Mycénienne*. Première série (1955-7). Pp. 397. Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Service des Publications, 1958. Cloth, 3,500 fr.

PROFESSOR LEJEUNE's book contains eight reprinted articles (chs. ii-ix) and six new ones (chs. x-xv). There are three appendixes—a concordance to Knossian texts, some amendments to the Index of Dr. Bennett's *Pylos Tablets* (1955), and a list of the author's publications from 1928 to 1954. Finally there are three indexes, to vocabulary, texts, and subject-matter.

All the chapters are concerned with Linear B, but they do not give a full or systematic account of 'Mycenaean Greek'. They do not even reflect any noticeable development in the writer's thought. They are simply a collection of articles. It is certainly convenient to have them indexed, but it seems doubtful whether this justifies the book. The six new chapters might well have found a resting-place in *Minos*, along with some of the older articles.

Like most European followers of the Ventris decipherment, Lejeune is conscientious in his treatment of evidence. He does not confine himself to the words and phrases that look most like Greek but attempts to review and explain everything. This in itself is laudable. It does not strengthen his arguments, however. No one who has difficulty in accepting the plausible bits is going to be won over by the bald statement that  $e-ke-ro-qo-no$  is equivalent to  $\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\upsilon\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (or  $\epsilon\gamma\chi\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\pi\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$ ). No sceptic will yield to the assertion that  $mo-ro-ko-wo-wo-pi$  means  $\text{Μοροκο-φόρφοι}$ , 'in the domain of Morokos' (Molokos?, Molox?). As for  $pi-pi$ , I once thought I had made a mild joke by suggesting that it was a personal name; but now Lejeune tells us in all seriousness that it refers to a Theban named  $\Pi\iota\mu\iota\varsigma$ !

It would be easier to swallow some of these explanations if the author showed himself acquainted with the roots of the decipherment; but he does not.



Let us consider, by way of example, his account of 'La Désinence - $\phi$ i en Mycénien' (ch. viii). Both Homeric - $\iota$  and final  $\text{39}$  in Linear B are discussed quite fully. The discussion reveals that there are far-reaching differences between the two endings. Lejeune concludes by saying that in 'Mycenaean Greek' - $\text{pi}$  is a living affix and so is used with a freedom unknown to the epic poets. The alternative explanation, that final  $\text{39}$  and Homeric - $\phi$ i may not after all be the same, does not occur to him even as something to be denied. Yet, if he had known his way about Ventris's early writings, it might have presented itself to him as a matter of importance.

Anyone who proposes to examine the function of  $\text{pi}$  or any other syllabic value must first learn how the decipherment as a whole was achieved. Lejeune doubtless imagines that Ventris began by constructing a grid 'dispassionately', hoping that it might yield Etruscan, and that later, to his surprise, it yielded Greek instead. But detailed examination of the unpublished *Worknotes* shows that what actually happened was rather different.<sup>1</sup>

Those who reject the decipherment cannot but sympathize with scholars who have taken it at its face value. Lejeune is clearly such a one. Having accepted  $\text{pi}$  without question on the strength of  $a\text{-pi-po-re-we}$  and  $qe\text{-to-ro-po-pi}$ , he feels bound to accept words like  $o\text{-pi}$ ,  $e\text{-pi}$ ,  $e\text{-ru-ta-ra-pi}$ , and  $ku\text{-te-re-u-pi}$ , whether the contexts in which they occur are cogent or not. He must believe that  $ta\text{-ra-nu-a-ja-me-no e-re-pa-le-ja-pi ka-ru-pi}$  refers to 'a footstool decorated with ivory nuts'. Ivory nuts on footstools have become part of his Greek world;  $ajamenos$  is a genuine Greek participle, and there is no need to inquire either into the ideogram alongside  $ta\text{-ra-nu}$  or into the validity of the syllable  $nu$ . He must also believe that  $pi\text{-je-ra}_3$  is the Mycenaean name for a large two-handled basin and at the same time the equivalent of Greek  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$ ; he ignores the fact that sign  $\text{33}$  was evaluated  $ra_3$  partly to make the equation  $pi\text{-je-33} = \phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha =$  'basin' and forgets that the only apparent confirmation of this value lies in the dubious equation  $e\text{-ra}_3\text{-wo} =$  '(a measure of) olive-oil'.

Chapter viii is not unique; all the other chapters too are based on assumptions derived from Ventris—assumptions which neither Ventris himself nor anyone else has made any serious attempt to prove. If the sign-values could be shown to be sound, the work which Lejeune has built on them would be useful. If, however, the values are not sound, it must be stated with regret that Lejeune, like other scholars who have taken the same risk, has wasted his time.

University of Edinburgh

A. J. BEATTIE

## MICHAEL VENTRIS AND HIS ACHIEVEMENT

JOHN CHADWICK: *The Decipherment of Linear B*. Pp. x+147. 2 plates, 17 figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

THE purpose of this book, as we learn from the Preface, is to present to the general reader the story of the decipherment of Linear B. This story can be made fully intelligible to him only in its setting; the history of the problem and the personality and intellectual gifts of Michael Ventris are indispensable to it. Accordingly there are chapters on Ventris; the Minoan scripts and their

<sup>1</sup> See *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung*, vi. 1 (1958), 61–76 and 84–104; also *The Glasgow Herald*, 27 and 29 May 1959, and my forthcoming *The Ventris Worknotes*, in which the history of the value  $\text{pi}$  will be traced.

derivatives in Cyprus; earlier attempts, mainly guesswork, at decipherment; their replacement since the war by methods based on cryptography, which culminated in Ventris's achievement; the progress of the work since the decipherment; the rapidly expanding body of agreement, collaboration, and published work, and the criticisms of the few who remain unconvinced. In the course of this tale are introduced a number of other topics, as, for example, the possible types of writing systems; the problems and conditions of deciphering unknown scripts and languages; above all, the discovery and publication of the Linear B tablets, a protracted tale of which the dramatic and personal aspects are well brought out by Chadwick's lively style and presentation. Further, since the reader who has admired the intellectual feat of the decipherment will wish to know what these tablets, so long enigmatic, have to say, there follow chapters on life in Mycenaean Greece and on the prospects of future work. An appendix contains a selection of nine texts in syllabic transcription, with phonetic reconstruction and translation.

The short biography of Ventris, 'a man whom nothing but superlatives fitted', is illustrated by the frontispiece, a handsome studio portrait, and by an informal photograph, in which he appears with Chadwick, on the dust jacket. The latter picture is primarily an illustration to a biographical note on the author, and it is a very welcome feature of the book, which in no way detracts from its principal character, that in telling the story fairly Chadwick cannot conceal his own personality and achievement. We not only see the beginning and progress of the co-operation between him and Ventris, and catch a glimpse of the more personal side of their relationship, but also can distinguish Chadwick's own outstanding contributions to the final stages of the decipherment and from then on to the interpretation of the texts.

From the point of view of the readers for whom the book is chiefly intended the first question is whether it gives a clear and coherent account of the decipherment. Certainly it is in this respect the best account to date; but one may wonder whether it will ever be possible to discern precisely the parts played by logical argument and by intuition. By describing previous attempts Chadwick strikingly displays the essential difference between them and the method employed by Ventris. Here due credit is given to the editorial and palaeographical work of Bennett and to the penetrating analysis of the then undeciphered texts by the late Alice Kober. Earlier workers had produced a few plausible guesses (notably the reading of the word for 'foal' by Sir Arthur Evans); it is encouraging to see how these find their place and their full explanation in Ventris's decipherment. The method of constructing the now famous syllabic Grid and its importance in controlling the allocation of values to signs is rightly stressed. It is made clear that the Grid, in the form in which it was used for the decipherment, contained a number of misplaced signs, and consequently that its employment was not a purely mechanical operation. In this connexion it might have been helpful to the reader to learn how the subsequent corrections were made, and especially that some at least of the misplacements were found to have a reasonable explanation in the rules of Mycenaean spelling and the archaic character of the dialect.

In the chapter on Ventris it is asserted that his decipherment 'has been fully vindicated during the last five years'. The account, in chapters 5 and 6, of its acceptance by prominent scholars of many countries, including most of the leading authorities on Greek linguistics, is the more impressive because their

Let us consider, by way of example, his account of 'La Désinence  $-\phi$  en Mycénien' (ch. viii). Both Homeric  $-i$  and final  $39$  in Linear B are discussed quite fully. The discussion reveals that there are far-reaching differences between the two endings. Lejeune concludes by saying that in 'Mycenaean Greek'  $-\pi$  is a living affix and so is used with a freedom unknown to the epic poets. The alternative explanation, that final  $39$  and Homeric  $-\phi$  may not after all be the same, does not occur to him even as something to be denied. Yet, if he had known his way about Ventris's early writings, it might have presented itself to him as a matter of importance.

Anyone who proposes to examine the function of  $\pi$  or any other syllabic value must first learn how the decipherment as a whole was achieved. Lejeune doubtless imagines that Ventris began by constructing a grid 'dispassionately', hoping that it might yield Etruscan, and that later, to his surprise, it yielded Greek instead. But detailed examination of the unpublished *Worknotes* shows that what actually happened was rather different.<sup>1</sup>

Those who reject the decipherment cannot but sympathize with scholars who have taken it at its face value. Lejeune is clearly such a one. Having accepted  $\pi$  without question on the strength of  $a\pi\pi o\text{-}re\text{-}we$  and  $qe\text{-}to\text{-}ro\text{-}\pi o\text{-}\pi i$ , he feels bound to accept words like  $o\pi i$ ,  $e\pi i$ ,  $e\text{-}ru\text{-}la\text{-}ra\text{-}\pi i$ , and  $ku\text{-}le\text{-}re\text{-}u\text{-}\pi i$ , whether the contexts in which they occur are cogent or not. He must believe that  $ta\text{-}ra\text{-}nu\text{-}a\text{-}ja\text{-}me\text{-}no\text{-}e\text{-}re\text{-}\pi a\text{-}le\text{-}ja\text{-}\pi i\text{-}ka\text{-}ru\text{-}\pi i$  refers to 'a footstool decorated with ivory nuts'. Ivory nuts on footstools have become part of his Greek world; *ajamenos* is a genuine Greek participle, and there is no need to inquire either into the ideogram alongside  $ta\text{-}ra\text{-}nu$  or into the validity of the syllable  $mu$ . He must also believe that  $\pi i\text{-}je\text{-}ra_3$  is the Mycenaean name for a large two-handled basin and at the same time the equivalent of Greek  $\phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha$ ; he ignores the fact that sign 33 was evaluated  $ra_3$  partly to make the equation  $\pi i\text{-}je\text{-}33 = \phi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha =$  'basin' and forgets that the only apparent confirmation of this value lies in the dubious equation  $e\text{-}ra_3\text{-}wo =$  '(a measure of) olive-oil'.

Chapter viii is not unique; all the other chapters too are based on assumptions derived from Ventris—assumptions which neither Ventris himself nor anyone else has made any serious attempt to prove. If the sign-values could be shown to be sound, the work which Lejeune has built on them would be useful. If, however, the values are not sound, it must be stated with regret that Lejeune, like other scholars who have taken the same risk, has wasted his time.

University of Edinburgh

A. J. BEATTIE

## MICHAEL VENTRIS AND HIS ACHIEVEMENT

JOHN CHADWICK: *The Decipherment of Linear B*. Pp. x + 147. 2 plates, 17 figures. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

THE purpose of this book, as we learn from the Preface, is to present to the general reader the story of the decipherment of Linear B. This story can be made fully intelligible to him only in its setting; the history of the problem and the personality and intellectual gifts of Michael Ventris are indispensable to it. Accordingly there are chapters on Ventris; the Minoan scripts and their

<sup>1</sup> See *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientalforschung*, vi. 1 (1958), 61–76 and 84–104; also *The Glasgow Herald*, 27 and 29 May 1959,

and my forthcoming *The Ventris Worknotes*, in which the history of the value  $\pi$  will be traced.

derivatives in Cyprus; earlier attempts, mainly guesswork, at decipherment; their replacement since the war by methods based on cryptography, which culminated in Ventris's achievement; the progress of the work since the decipherment; the rapidly expanding body of agreement, collaboration, and published work, and the criticisms of the few who remain unconvinced. In the course of this tale are introduced a number of other topics, as, for example, the possible types of writing systems; the problems and conditions of deciphering unknown scripts and languages; above all, the discovery and publication of the Linear B tablets, a protracted tale of which the dramatic and personal aspects are well brought out by Chadwick's lively style and presentation. Further, since the reader who has admired the intellectual feat of the decipherment will wish to know what these tablets, so long enigmatic, have to say, there follow chapters on life in Mycenaean Greece and on the prospects of future work. An appendix contains a selection of nine texts in syllabic transcription, with phonetic reconstruction and translation.

The short biography of Ventris, 'a man whom nothing but superlatives fitted', is illustrated by the frontispiece, a handsome studio portrait, and by an informal photograph, in which he appears with Chadwick, on the dust jacket. The latter picture is primarily an illustration to a biographical note on the author, and it is a very welcome feature of the book, which in no way detracts from its principal character, that in telling the story fairly Chadwick cannot conceal his own personality and achievement. We not only see the beginning and progress of the co-operation between him and Ventris, and catch a glimpse of the more personal side of their relationship, but also can distinguish Chadwick's own outstanding contributions to the final stages of the decipherment and from then on to the interpretation of the texts.

From the point of view of the readers for whom the book is chiefly intended the first question is whether it gives a clear and coherent account of the decipherment. Certainly it is in this respect the best account to date; but one may wonder whether it will ever be possible to discern precisely the parts played by logical argument and by intuition. By describing previous attempts Chadwick strikingly displays the essential difference between them and the method employed by Ventris. Here due credit is given to the editorial and palaeographical work of Bennett and to the penetrating analysis of the then undeciphered texts by the late Alice Kober. Earlier workers had produced a few plausible guesses (notably the reading of the word for 'foal' by Sir Arthur Evans); it is encouraging to see how these find their place and their full explanation in Ventris's decipherment. The method of constructing the now famous syllabic Grid and its importance in controlling the allocation of values to signs is rightly stressed. It is made clear that the Grid, in the form in which it was used for the decipherment, contained a number of misplaced signs, and consequently that its employment was not a purely mechanical operation. In this connexion it might have been helpful to the reader to learn how the subsequent corrections were made, and especially that some at least of the misplacements were found to have a reasonable explanation in the rules of Mycenaean spelling and the archaic character of the dialect.

In the chapter on Ventris it is asserted that his decipherment 'has been fully vindicated during the last five years'. The account, in chapters 5 and 6, of its acceptance by prominent scholars of many countries, including most of the leading authorities on Greek linguistics, is the more impressive because their

agreement was always critically given and in some cases almost reluctantly conceded. At the same time considerable attention is paid to the arguments of the scattered few who still reject the decipherment. That the attack is increasingly difficult to maintain is perhaps indicated by the fact that it has recently veered more and more from the results to the method, in an attempt to show that Ventris's own accounts, including the information in his series of *Work Notes*, are unsatisfactory and even disingenuous. Although this criticism has come too late to be answered in this book, Chadwick's remark is relevant: 'It is no longer of any consequence to know how the values were obtained; the words they yield constitute their own proof' (p. 92). This is the contention to the demonstration of which much of chapter 6 is devoted. When the proportion of Greek words identified by ideograms or supported by consistent and probable contexts, and conforming to Greek inflexional and syntactical patterns, reaches a certain point, the only straightforward explanation is that, despite all remaining obscurities, the language is Greek; and in the opinion of the great majority of competent judges that point has been reached and passed.

In his chapter on the civilization revealed by the tablets Chadwick has not shirked controversial issues, and with characteristic fairness has warned his readers that the views expressed are not in every case accepted by all authorities. In any case it is this part of the book which is inevitably most provisional owing to the rapid accumulation of new discoveries and views.

Each reader will no doubt find matters for question and discussion, as well as a few minor points to criticize. For example, figure 3 on page 12, illustrating Cretan hieroglyphic writing, scarcely seems to bear out the statement that this script 'consisted of pictorial signs, representing generally recognizable objects'. In chapter 4 Chadwick discusses the different problems presented to a decipherer according to whether the script, the language, or both are unknown. He seems to use 'unknown' in two senses, both of unintelligible languages (like Etruscan) and of those which are unidentified so long as the script is unread (like Mycenaean Greek). Are the cases of the Linear B tablets and the Old Persian inscriptions different in principle? In both the decipherers were faced with an unidentified language in an unread script, and in both, after the decipherment of the script, it was found possible to read the languages by their resemblance to other forms of Greek and Iranian respectively. On page 127, speaking of the absence of an identifiable Mycenaean word for 'scribe', Chadwick notes that *γράφω*, originally 'scratch', would have been a suitable term for writing on clay; but at the same time that the Cypriots may have preserved in *άλινω*, properly 'paint', the Mycenaean word for 'write'. This suggestion receives support, which he himself does not adduce, from his own pages, since he remarks elsewhere (pp. 21, 130) that the character of Linear B script is less suited to scratching on clay than to tracing with ink. It is certainly conceivable that the only Greek people to derive their script from Mycenaean times should have preserved the word for writing it. In the appendix of selected tablets it might have been helpful, especially for readers who have no Greek, to indicate all words of uncertain meaning and all which are not represented in any form in later Greek. Some may regret that for typographical reasons Linear B signs are mostly represented by numerals. They will be consoled by the excellent photographs and drawings of tablets and by a sheet which, unfolded from the end of the book, conveniently displays the syllabary with phonetic values and numeral equivalents.



In this attractive book Chadwick shows not only his scholarship and gift of clear exposition, but also a story-teller's flair for the dramatic moments of an exciting tale. His book is a pleasure to read; it is also, thanks to the Cambridge University Press, an ornament to the bookshelf, and even the elegant dust jacket, with its notes and illustrations, was designed for a better fate than the waste-paper-basket.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## MYCENAEAN NOMENCLATURE

OSCAR LANDAU: *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen*. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, vii.) Pp. 305. Gothenburg: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958. Paper, kr. 28.

THE high proportion of personal names in the Mycenaean texts in itself ensures the importance of so ample a treatment as that of Landau. His introduction sets out the principles for recognizing personal names and gives the table of syllabic values, with some discussion of the rarer signs. There follows an alphabetical catalogue occupying some 140 pages, giving each name in syllabic transcription, the interpretations suggested by Landau and others, and the references to the tablets in which it occurs and the pages in the later sections of the book on which it is discussed. In the second part of the book the names are classified, first according to their formation, secondly by meaning, with the object of showing from what semantic fields Mycenaean nomenclature is derived. A final chapter presents statistics and general conclusions. Of the three excursuses, two are likely to be of particular interest outside the circle of specialists; the first catalogues the names of gods and heroes attested in the Linear B texts, and the second lists those names which, designating ordinary persons in Mycenaean, recur in later literature as names of heroic and mythological characters.

The recognition of personal names by structural study of the texts began even before the decipherment. There remains comparatively little disagreement among experts as to whether a particular sign-group is a name. There are nevertheless doubtful cases, of which Landau admits little discussion. He is consistent in excluding those items of KN B 798 which are followed by a numeral higher than 1, but offers no comment on the few instances in which he thus differs from Ventris and Chadwick. *ke-re-no* occurs at PY Cn599. 6 in a context which indicates unmistakably a personal name, and again at MY Au102. 6 followed by the numeral 2; Landau accordingly rejects it as a personal name in the latter passage, but without considering the possibility (suggested in *The Mycenaean Tablets*, ii. 106) that the numeral is wrong. He revives *Αἰγέως* in PY Ta641. 1, noting the hesitation expressed in *Docs.* p. 414 ('possibly not a man's name'), but not Palmer's outright rejection of it.

There is less agreement on interpretation, in contrast to simple recognition. Landau claims as interpreted close to 60 per cent. of names preserved entire; but some of the interpretations are unconvincing. \**Δέρμοψ*, \**Θεόπους*, \**Λειπόεις* (or their Mycenaean equivalents) are hard to credit, and, even allowing for differences of taste, \**Εύλαῖος* (from *εὐλή*) and \**Κονιδάιος* (from *κονίς*) are unattractive. Objection may be raised in some instances on formal grounds. Landau takes *a-ta-ro-we* as \**Ἀταλόφεις* to *ἄταλος*; but those epic adjectives in



-(*φ*)εντ- which are mere extensions of adjectives in other stems appear to be metrical variants, an impossibility in the case of \*Ἀταλόφενς. May it not be an alternative spelling for *ai-ta-ro-we* \*Αἰθαλόφενς (*Αἰθαλόεις*), as Lejeune suggests in *Études mycéniennes*, p. 44, and derived from the noun αἰθαλος rather than the later attested adjective? Landau explains a group of names in *-wa-lo*, *-wa-ta* as compounds in *-φαστος*, *-φαστας* from *φάστυ*; some appear to have a place-name as first element. Here a comment on the absence of this type in later Greek would have been in place; and still more a note on the lack of *w* after the *t*, in view of *Thess. φαστρός* (which he quotes) and the general Mycenaean conservation of *w* after plosives. A number of Mycenaean names begin in *ja-*, and Landau is not the first to explain some of these as names in \**Ia-* (e.g. *ja-sa-no* \**Iasánwō*). He passes over the discrepancy between the Mycenaean consonantal *j-* and the later syllabic \**I-*.

The interpreter of a Mycenaean name is naturally best satisfied if the same or a closely similar name can be found in later use. The number of cases in which this is possible is highly encouraging. Yet all names attested in literature are not of equal value for this purpose. *po-ti-jo* may well be Πόντιος (Landau agrees with *Documents*), but the likelihood is little strengthened by the occurrence of Πόντιος as a fisherman's name in Alciphron.

A fair number of miscellaneous details could be questioned. In his transcription, why does Landau write *γ<sup>wh</sup>* and *γ<sup>h</sup>* for the aspirated labio-velar and aspirated palatal followed by *w* respectively, since the evidence of the dentals indicates that aspirates were already unvoiced? He offers without question the old etymology of παντ- < I-E \**kwānt-* (pp. 157, 159). His note on *a<sub>2</sub>* (pp. 171-2; one of several useful collections of data outside his main subject) is inadequate to prove its special use for *ha* (contrast M. Lejeune, *Études mycéniennes*, pp. 46 ff.). It is not \**īhai* but \**īha* which corresponds to Skt. *ihā* (not *ihā*, as Landau gives it, p. 215). He takes *wi-wo-wo-i-jo* as a scribal error (p. 199), ignoring Risch's discovery that it must be read, as expected, *wi-d(u)wo-i-jo*. The checking and proof-reading of this book must have required unusual concentration, and it is not surprising that a few slips occur, and that some of them do not appear on the sheet of corrigenda, both simple misprints (κλαφιφορος p. 222) and more complicated errors (e.g. in the quotation from Anaxandrides, p. 191). The false reading *22-ri-ta-ro* is given on p. 13, the correct *qi-ri-ta-ro* on p. 117. The reference for *ta-di-22-so* is given correctly as KN X 5564 on p. 131, but as Th. VII on p. 13, perhaps through confusion with *ta-22-de-so* (quoted without reference on p. 13, but from Th. VII on p. 134).

More important than the recording of minor errors is to note Landau's general observations and conclusions. He thinks, for example, that there is a higher proportion of non-Greek names at Knossos than at Pylos, and among humble folk (smiths, shepherds, slaves) than in the higher ranks of society (e.g. βασιλῆες and *o-ka* commanders)—a claim of obvious historical importance if further research substantiates it. Among his statistical tables Landau gives the frequencies of the first and second elements in compound names; with due allowance for the uncertainty of many interpretations, it is possible to form some notion of the Mycenaean preferences, which do not correspond entirely with those of classical Greece.

Landau has earned the gratitude of students of Mycenaean language and civilization both by his painstaking collection and ordering of material and by his suggestions for its interpretation. His book justifies the contention of the

Introduction, that Mycenaean nomenclature is relevant not only to the history of the Greek language, but to 'die Grundlagen der griechischen Kultur im allgemeinen'.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## LATET AVRVM IN COLLIBVS ISTIS

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *From Mycenae to Homer*. Pp. xvi+312; 24 plates, 1 map. London: Methuen, 1958. Cloth, 30s. net.

CEDRIC H. WHITMAN, *Homer and the Homeric Tradition*. Pp. xvi+365, 1 text-fig., 1 folding diagram. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 40s. net.

EVER since the days of Theagenes of Rhegium, prospectors have been setting out for the Homeric Klondyke, in the wholly justified confidence that they will find 'gold in them thar hills', and the flow shows no sign of diminishing. Professor Webster is, it may be said without disrespect, a sourdough in these diggings, with an already well-marked claim high up Linear B Creek, whereas Mr. Whitman, for all his experience with Sophocles, is still a tenderfoot in Homeric matters. A comparison of their two books, which appeared too close together for either author to have known what the other had discovered, will, I think, serve to show that experience cannot always save the seeker from occasionally mistaking iron pyrites for gold, any more than inexperience (even when equipped with faulty implements) can always prevent its possessor from striking 'pay-dirt'. What, to continue the metaphor for a little longer, is most noticeable about Mr. Whitman's account of his expedition is that inexperience cannot always save its possessor from a suspicion that he may have been jumping other prospectors' claims.

The general nature of Professor Webster's equipment for a study of the development of the Homeric poems is too well known to need detailed description; but his competence in this matter has already been demonstrated by a number of distinguished articles upon different aspects of his theme, and his skill in dealing with problems arising from the relation of literary and artistic developments has full scope in the present inquiry. It may be noticed first that the back of his title-page bears an announcement that royalties on the sale of his book will be given to the Michael Ventris Memorial Fund; and I think that it can properly be said that the book seems admirably designed to ensure a considerable contribution to that object—it is clear that it will be a long time before *From Mycenae to Homer* has any serious competitor, and though it is by no means easy reading, especially in the archaeological parts, it is not too hard to be read by persevering non-specialists. The demand for this book may be expected to be stimulated by the almost simultaneous appearance of Mr. Chadwick's *Decipherment of Linear B*; readers of that book who wish to pursue the matter farther, but are intimidated by the massive appearance of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, will find Webster's book less formidable in appearance and more immediately communicative. The book is well, but very unpretentiously, produced (a rather solidier binding might have been an advantage); the illustrations are good, and go far (within the inevitable limitations imposed by costs of production) to illustrate the points which Webster makes. A

-(*φ*)εντ- which are mere extensions of adjectives in other stems appear to be metrical variants, an impossibility in the case of \*Ἀταλόφενς. May it not be an alternative spelling for *ai-ta-ro-we* \*Αἰθαλόφενς (*Αἰθαλόεις*), as Lejeune suggests in *Études mycéniennes*, p. 44, and derived from the noun αἶθαλος rather than the later attested adjective? Landau explains a group of names in *-wa-to*, *-ua-ta* as compounds in *-φαστος*, *-φαστας* from *φάστυ*; some appear to have a place-name as first element. Here a comment on the absence of this type in later Greek would have been in place; and still more a note on the lack of *w* after the *t*, in view of Thess. *φαστρός* (which he quotes) and the general Mycenaean conservation of *w* after plosives. A number of Mycenaean names begin in *ja-*, and Landau is not the first to explain some of these as names in *'Ia-* (e.g. *ja-sa-no* \*Ἰασάνωπ). He passes over the discrepancy between the Mycenaean consonantal *j-* and the later syllabic *'I-*.

The interpreter of a Mycenaean name is naturally best satisfied if the same or a closely similar name can be found in later use. The number of cases in which this is possible is highly encouraging. Yet all names attested in literature are not of equal value for this purpose. *po-ti-jo* may well be Πόντιος (Landau agrees with *Documents*), but the likelihood is little strengthened by the occurrence of Πόντιος as a fisherman's name in Alciphron.

A fair number of miscellaneous details could be questioned. In his transcription, why does Landau write *γ<sup>w</sup>h* and *γ<sup>w</sup>h* for the aspirated labio-velar and aspirated palatal followed by *w* respectively, since the evidence of the dentals indicates that aspirates were already unvoiced? He offers without question the old etymology of παντ- (I-E \**kwānt-* (pp. 157, 159). His note on *a<sub>2</sub>* (pp. 171-2; one of several useful collections of data outside his main subject) is inadequate to prove its special use for *ha* (contrast M. Lejeune, *Études mycéniennes*, pp. 46 ff.). It is not \**iθai* but \**iθα* which corresponds to Skt. *ihā* (not *ihā*, as Landau gives it, p. 215). He takes *wi-wo-wo-i-jo* as a scribal error (p. 199), ignoring Risch's discovery that it must be read, as expected, *wi-d(u)wo-i-jo*. The checking and proof-reading of this book must have required unusual concentration, and it is not surprising that a few slips occur, and that some of them do not appear on the sheet of corrigenda, both simple misprints (κλαφιφορος p. 222) and more complicated errors (e.g. in the quotation from Anaxandrides, p. 191). The false reading *22-ri-ta-ro* is given on p. 13, the correct *qi-ri-ta-ro* on p. 117. The reference for *ta-di-22-so* is given correctly as KN X 5564 on p. 131, but as Th. VII on p. 13, perhaps through confusion with *ta-22-de-so* (quoted without reference on p. 13, but from Th. VII on p. 134).

More important than the recording of minor errors is to note Landau's general observations and conclusions. He thinks, for example, that there is a higher proportion of non-Greek names at Knossos than at Pylos, and among humble folk (smiths, shepherds, slaves) than in the higher ranks of society (e.g. βασιλῆες and *o-ka* commanders)—a claim of obvious historical importance if further research substantiates it. Among his statistical tables Landau gives the frequencies of the first and second elements in compound names; with due allowance for the uncertainty of many interpretations, it is possible to form some notion of the Mycenaean preferences, which do not correspond entirely with those of classical Greece.

Landau has earned the gratitude of students of Mycenaean language and civilization both by his painstaking collection and ordering of material and by his suggestions for its interpretation. His book justifies the contention of the

Introduction, that Mycenaean nomenclature is relevant not only to the history of the Greek language, but to 'die Grundlagen der griechischen Kultur im allgemeinen'.

Westfield College, London

D. M. JONES

## LATET AVRVM IN COLLIBVS ISTIS

T. B. L. WEBSTER: *From Mycenae to Homer*. Pp. xvi+312; 24 plates, 1 map. London: Methuen, 1958. Cloth, 30s. net.

CEDRIC H. WHITMAN, *Homer and the Homeric Tradition*. Pp. xvi+365, 1 text-fig., 1 folding diagram. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 40s. net.

EVER since the days of Theagenes of Rhegium, prospectors have been setting out for the Homeric Klondyke, in the wholly justified confidence that they will find 'gold in them thar hills', and the flow shows no sign of diminishing. Professor Webster is, it may be said without disrespect, a sourdough in these diggings, with an already well-marked claim high up Linear B Creek, whereas Mr. Whitman, for all his experience with Sophocles, is still a tenderfoot in Homeric matters. A comparison of their two books, which appeared too close together for either author to have known what the other had discovered, will, I think, serve to show that experience cannot always save the seeker from occasionally mistaking iron pyrites for gold, any more than inexperience (even when equipped with faulty implements) can always prevent its possessor from striking 'pay-dirt'. What, to continue the metaphor for a little longer, is most noticeable about Mr. Whitman's account of his expedition is that inexperience cannot always save its possessor from a suspicion that he may have been jumping other prospectors' claims.

The general nature of Professor Webster's equipment for a study of the development of the Homeric poems is too well known to need detailed description; but his competence in this matter has already been demonstrated by a number of distinguished articles upon different aspects of his theme, and his skill in dealing with problems arising from the relation of literary and artistic developments has full scope in the present inquiry. It may be noticed first that the back of his title-page bears an announcement that royalties on the sale of his book will be given to the Michael Ventris Memorial Fund; and I think that it can properly be said that the book seems admirably designed to ensure a considerable contribution to that object—it is clear that it will be a long time before *From Mycenae to Homer* has any serious competitor, and though it is by no means easy reading, especially in the archaeological parts, it is not too hard to be read by persevering non-specialists. The demand for this book may be expected to be stimulated by the almost simultaneous appearance of Mr. Chadwick's *Decipherment of Linear B*; readers of that book who wish to pursue the matter farther, but are intimidated by the massive appearance of *Documents in Mycenaean Greek*, will find Webster's book less formidable in appearance and more immediately communicative. The book is well, but very unpretentiously, produced (a rather solidier binding might have been an advantage); the illustrations are good, and go far (within the inevitable limitations imposed by costs of production) to illustrate the points which Webster makes. A

chronological table (pp. xv-xvi) precedes the introduction; it is perhaps unfortunate that the book was already published before Professor C. W. Blegen (in *Minoica*, 1958, pp. 61-66) produced his reasons for thinking that Linear B was not in use in Cnossus anything like as early as 1450 B.C. (the date which has hitherto been accepted on Evans's authority). If Blegen is right (and there is good reason for thinking that he may be), the whole theory of Greek-speaking rulers at Cnossus in L.M. II will have to be abandoned—and, in my opinion at least, a good thing too.

In his introduction (1-5), Webster claims that 'The possibility of drawing a picture of Mycenaean civilization from its documents and not only from archaeology . . ., the linguistic evidence that Mycenaean Greeks were in contact with the East, and the determination of Mycenaean Greek as a stage which can be distinguished in the development of the Greek language have come at a time when knowledge of the contemporary Eastern world is both fuller and more accessible to the classical scholar than it has ever been before.' Webster's purpose is to show how the gap between the Mycenaean age, as he thinks we can now understand it, and the period at which Homer composed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (even if this identification is intended only as a working hypothesis, I must say I envy the confidence with which Webster propounds it), can be bridged by recognizing three periods in the history alike of Greek literature and Greek art: first, the Mycenaean period proper (down to about 1200 B.C.); second, the period between the destruction of the palaces and about 900, covering the Dorian invasion and the Ionian migration ('Sub-Mycenaean' and 'Protogeometric' art); third, the period 900-700, comprising the recovery after the age of confusion, the rise of city-states, and the beginnings of colonization ('Geometric' art). These themes Webster pursues through eight main chapters and a chapter devoted to conclusion and summary. His plates illustrate thirty-eight separate objects, from tablets found at Pylos to a Cretan bronze shield (twenty are Mycenaean, two Attic protogeometric and fifteen Attic geometric); the outline map (at the end of the book) is obviously the result of a compromise—it is entitled 'The Homeric World', but has not made up its mind whether it is to show the world as presupposed in 'Homer' (as defined by Webster) or important sites relevant to the whole theme of the book.

Chapter i ('Records of Society in the Second Millennium', 7-26) gives a wonderfully concise account of the contents of Linear B texts and of comparable records from the literate civilizations of the Near East. Webster points out that we have not yet discovered the Mycenaean word for 'scribe', and that we have no juridical or literary texts, such as are known from farther East. Literature and law may therefore still have been in the oral stage of development among the 'Achaean' (as we see them in Homer's descriptions); or texts of these classes may have been preserved on some material more convenient but less fire-resistant than clay tablets. The next chapter ('Mycenaean Art in its Setting', 27-63) is an equally masterly collection of the evidence for 'internationalism in art' in the late bronze age; here Webster emphasizes that evidence that artistic motifs travelled freely from Western Asia to Eastern Europe should not be accepted without corroboration as proof that the original interpretations of these motifs accompanied them. The third and fourth chapters ('Eastern Poetry and Mycenaean Poetry', 64-90; 'Mycenaean Poetry', 91-135) deal firstly with those features of Anatolian, Syrian, and Mesopotamian literature which seem analogous to those of the earliest known



(and inferable) forms of Greek literature, together with those features of Mycenaean texts which appear to be ancestral to Homeric diction, and then give an account of what may, in Webster's opinion, be legitimately inferred about the nature of Mycenaean literature from these two sources. Webster insists on the origin of epic formulae in religious or court protocol (where every deity or officer must be addressed in the proper form), as well as from what one may call the 'Vocabulary of Ordnance Stores' or even the *inquisitio post mortem* (as we seem to see them in the Linear B tablets). It is inevitable, given the nature of the evidence, that he is forced to depend heavily on analogies (which may not always be conclusive), and I am inclined to think that he puts too much faith in the hypotheses of M. Leumann (*Homerische Wörter*) as a means of dating Homeric formulae. The interesting attempt in the fifth chapter ('The Collapse of Mycenaean Civilization and the Ionian Migration', 136-58) to reconstruct the course of events between the twelfth and eighth centuries B.C. is vitiated for me by Webster's uncritical acceptance of such legendary figures (unknown, it seems, alike to Herodotus and Aristotle) as Arctinus and Lesches; and I am not much happier about his suggested reconstruction of the literature of the period in Chapter vi ('Poetry between the Fall of Mycenae and the Time of Homer', 159-86). Here he seems to me too ready to identify figures in scenes on Geometric vases with characters whom we know from later sources—I doubt if our *Prosopographia Heroica* is quite as reliable as all that. In this chapter, I feel, Webster might have made more use of Milman Parry's ideas about oral narrative poetry, to say nothing of the great collections of material in the first volume of the Chadwicks' *Growth of Literature*. The seventh chapter is an account, done with all Webster's skill in such matters, of the main characteristics of 'Protogeometric and Geometric Art' (187-207), with emphasis on the use of symmetry, both vertical and horizontal, and of proportion, in the distribution of patterns. This is fascinating, but could have been made a little easier to follow by the provision of some text-figures. The main weight of the book, however, comes in chapter viii ('Homer and His Immediate Predecessors', 208-83), in which Webster deals successively with late elements in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, similes, typical scenes and special narratives, the composition of the poems (with some emphasis on the Geometric elements of harmony and proportion, though in nothing like the detail indulged in by Whitman), the manner of performance, and the relation of the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey* (Webster dismisses, rightly as I think, but not on completely satisfying grounds, Professor Page's arguments for the isolation of the *Odyssey* from the *Iliad*; but he does not deal with other arguments for separate authorship, e.g. those of Schadewaldt). Of the final chapter (284-98), it need only be said that it provides a fair summary of the main argument of the book. There is a good index.

Mr. Whitman's book, it must frankly be said, is almost impossible for the mere 'Limey' to judge fairly, since it is written for the most part in a language which bears little relation to English, as that term is understood in England.<sup>1</sup> He loaded his expedition up with a great deal of highly advertised and (at least at first sight) marvellously impressive information; but it is packed, as the man-o'-war's man disgustedly said, 'All fisher-fashion, everything on top and

<sup>1</sup> It is really high time that the American *sermo campester* (with its congeners Pentagorian and Unescovite) was recognized as

an independent language, belonging to what may be called the 'Britonce' family (Britonce: English:: Romance: Latin).



chronological table (pp. xv-xvi) precedes the introduction; it is perhaps unfortunate that the book was already published before Professor C. W. Blegen (in *Minoica*, 1958, pp. 61-66) produced his reasons for thinking that Linear B was not in use in Cnossus anything like as early as 1450 B.C. (the date which has hitherto been accepted on Evans's authority). If Blegen is right (and there is good reason for thinking that he may be), the whole theory of Greek-speaking rulers at Cnossus in L.M. II will have to be abandoned—and, in my opinion at least, a good thing too.

In his introduction (1-5), Webster claims that 'The possibility of drawing a picture of Mycenaean civilization from its documents and not only from archaeology . . ., the linguistic evidence that Mycenaean Greeks were in contact with the East, and the determination of Mycenaean Greek as a stage which can be distinguished in the development of the Greek language have come at a time when knowledge of the contemporary Eastern world is both fuller and more accessible to the classical scholar than it has ever been before.' Webster's purpose is to show how the gap between the Mycenaean age, as he thinks we can now understand it, and the period at which Homer composed the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* (even if this identification is intended only as a working hypothesis, I must say I envy the confidence with which Webster propounds it), can be bridged by recognizing three periods in the history alike of Greek literature and Greek art: first, the Mycenaean period proper (down to about 1200 B.C.); second, the period between the destruction of the palaces and about 900, covering the Dorian invasion and the Ionian migration ('Sub-Mycenaean' and 'Protogeometric' art); third, the period 900-700, comprising the recovery after the age of confusion, the rise of city-states, and the beginnings of colonization ('Geometric' art). These themes Webster pursues through eight main chapters and a chapter devoted to conclusion and summary. His plates illustrate thirty-eight separate objects, from tablets found at Pylos to a Cretan bronze shield (twenty are Mycenaean, two Attic protogeometric and fifteen Attic geometric); the outline map (at the end of the book) is obviously the result of a compromise—it is entitled 'The Homeric World', but has not made up its mind whether it is to show the world as presupposed in 'Homer' (as defined by Webster) or important sites relevant to the whole theme of the book.

Chapter i ('Records of Society in the Second Millennium', 7-26) gives a wonderfully concise account of the contents of Linear B texts and of comparable records from the literate civilizations of the Near East. Webster points out that we have not yet discovered the Mycenaean word for 'scribe', and that we have no juridical or literary texts, such as are known from farther East. Literature and law may therefore still have been in the oral stage of development among the 'Achaean' (as we see them in Homer's descriptions); or texts of these classes may have been preserved on some material more convenient but less fire-resistant than clay tablets. The next chapter ('Mycenaean Art in its Setting', 27-63) is an equally masterly collection of the evidence for 'internationalism in art' in the late bronze age; here Webster emphasizes that evidence that artistic motifs travelled freely from Western Asia to Eastern Europe should not be accepted without corroboration as proof that the original interpretations of these motifs accompanied them. The third and fourth chapters ('Eastern Poetry and Mycenaean Poetry', 64-90; 'Mycenaean Poetry', 91-135) deal firstly with those features of Anatolian, Syrian, and Mesopotamian literature which seem analogous to those of the earliest known

(and inferable) forms of Greek literature, together with those features of Mycenaean texts which appear to be ancestral to Homeric diction, and then give an account of what may, in Webster's opinion, be legitimately inferred about the nature of Mycenaean literature from these two sources. Webster insists on the origin of epic formulae in religious or court protocol (where every deity or officer must be addressed in the proper form), as well as from what one may call the 'Vocabulary of Ordnance Stores' or even the *inquisitio post mortem* (as we seem to see them in the Linear B tablets). It is inevitable, given the nature of the evidence, that he is forced to depend heavily on analogies (which may not always be conclusive), and I am inclined to think that he puts too much faith in the hypotheses of M. Leumann (*Homerische Wörter*) as a means of dating Homeric formulae. The interesting attempt in the fifth chapter ('The Collapse of Mycenaean Civilization and the Ionian Migration', 136-58) to reconstruct the course of events between the twelfth and eighth centuries B.C. is vitiated for me by Webster's uncritical acceptance of such legendary figures (unknown, it seems, alike to Herodotus and Aristotle) as Arctinus and Lesches; and I am not much happier about his suggested reconstruction of the literature of the period in Chapter vi ('Poetry between the Fall of Mycenae and the Time of Homer', 159-86). Here he seems to me too ready to identify figures in scenes on Geometric vases with characters whom we know from later sources—I doubt if our *Prosopographia Heroica* is quite as reliable as all that. In this chapter, I feel, Webster might have made more use of Milman Parry's ideas about oral narrative poetry, to say nothing of the great collections of material in the first volume of the Chadwicks' *Growth of Literature*. The seventh chapter is an account, done with all Webster's skill in such matters, of the main characteristics of 'Protogeometric and Geometric Art' (187-207), with emphasis on the use of symmetry, both vertical and horizontal, and of proportion, in the distribution of patterns. This is fascinating, but could have been made a little easier to follow by the provision of some text-figures. The main weight of the book, however, comes in chapter viii ('Homer and His Immediate Predecessors', 208-83), in which Webster deals successively with late elements in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, similes, typical scenes and special narratives, the composition of the poems (with some emphasis on the Geometric elements of harmony and proportion, though in nothing like the detail indulged in by Whitman), the manner of performance, and the relation of the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey* (Webster dismisses, rightly as I think, but not on completely satisfying grounds, Professor Page's arguments for the isolation of the *Odyssey* from the *Iliad*; but he does not deal with other arguments for separate authorship, e.g. those of Schadewaldt). Of the final chapter (284-98), it need only be said that it provides a fair summary of the main argument of the book. There is a good index.

Mr. Whitman's book, it must frankly be said, is almost impossible for the mere 'Limey' to judge fairly, since it is written for the most part in a language which bears little relation to English, as that term is understood in England.<sup>1</sup> He loaded his expedition up with a great deal of highly advertised and (at least at first sight) marvellously impressive information; but it is packed, as the man-o'-war's man disgustingly said, 'All fisher-fashion, everything on top and

<sup>1</sup> It is really high time that the American *sermo campester* (with its congeners Penta-gonian and Unescovite) was recognized as

an independent language, belonging to what may be called the 'Britonce' family (Britonce: English:: Romance: Latin).

nothing handy', and it is only at intervals that one comes dimly to recognize through the whirling drifts of linguistic smog that he took some at least of the right equipment along with him. My own view, based on a fairly extensive acquaintance with one or two of the mutations of English which have come into official and academic use in the United States since the days of H. L. Mencken, is that Whitman's preliminary survey of his chosen field has been inadequate, and that even where he is putting forward sound views he is not sufficiently conscious that others may have put them forward before; of his misconceptions I can only say that he could have been saved from some of them by a wider acquaintance with the recent literature of his subject. The book is, as befits its higher price, more solidly produced than Webster's; but though it covers much of the same ground (especially the relation of the structure of the *Iliad* to the patterns of Geometric art), the publishers have not allowed him a single illustration, either plate or text-figure, to make the argument of this part of the book more easily intelligible. No doubt plates would have increased the cost of the book; but something could have been saved by rewriting the text in simpler language, and by confining the notes to matters of substance (mere line-references to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, for example, could surely have been included in the text).

Whitman begins with a rather optimistic chapter (pp. 1-16) on 'The Meaning of Unity', which suggests that he has failed to observe the continued existence and vitality of the disintegrators; he follows this with a chapter on 'The Memory of the Achaeans' (17-46), dealing with the history of the period from Homer back to the zenith of the Mycenaean age (this chapter is provided with the only illustration—a sketch-map of the 'Probable Distribution of Dialects in the Mycenaean Age', which operates rather startlingly with separate symbols for 'Aeolic', 'Achaean', and 'Ionic'). The third chapter (46-64) deals with the development of Athens from 1200 to 700 B.C., emphasizing the vital importance of Athens for the artistic (and, by perfectly fair inference, the literary) development of Greece in this period. This leads to a much less satisfactory chapter (65-86) on 'Festivals, Pisistratus and Writing', of which I can say only that since he is so far prepared to abandon his belief in the artistic unity of the *Iliad* as to be inclined to approve the suggestion that Pisistratus inserted the *Doloneia* into the *Iliad*, he obviously has not understood the very elements of the problem.<sup>1</sup> The next chapter ('Homer and Geometric Art', 87-101) naturally suffers heavily by comparison with Webster's treatment of the same subject; but its main purpose is to prepare for Whitman's analysis of the 'Geometric Structure of the *Iliad*', which is to follow in chapter xi (249-84). Before that, we have to struggle through a chapter on 'Image, Symbol and Formula' (102-27), the general argument of which (if I have rightly understood it) is then exemplified by a discussion of Homer's treatment of 'Fire and Other Elements' (128-53). Both of these chapters, though foggy in general, contain many good individual points, as does that on 'Homeric Character and the Tradition' (154-80); but the main argument, both of this chapter and its successor

<sup>1</sup> Discussing the revised chapters of *Persuasion*, Miss Mary Lascelles suggested that one reason for regarding the episode of Mrs. Smith as an 'improvisation' by the author is that 'it is not neatly joined on at the end to the rest of the narrative' (*Jane Austen and her Art* [Oxford, 1939], p. 194). This argument seems

to me exactly applicable to the *Doloneia*; it follows well on Book ix, but has little (if any) influence on Books xi-xxiv. For Pisistratus and the Panathenaea, I may perhaps be allowed to refer to my articles in *T.A.P.A.* lxxxvi (1955), 1-21 (not mentioned by Whitman) and *J.H.S.* lxxviii (1958), 23-42.

('Achilles', 181-220), would have benefited if the author had read F. Robert's *Homère* (Paris, 1950), especially the chapter on 'Peinture de l'être humain' (pp. 214-71). The remaining chapters, 'Fate, Time and the Gods' (221-48) and 'The Odyssey and Change' (285-309), call for little comment. The notes follow the text (311-56); and there is a rather scrappy index.

Whitman is, as might be expected, a convinced follower of Milman Parry; and in this he may have some advantage over Webster, especially since he is careful to point out that none of the modern Slavonic narrative poems approaches the *Iliad* in complexity of structure, even if some do rival (or even surpass) the *Iliad* in bulk. But I think that both Webster and he go too far in their comparisons of Geometric art and the structure of the *Iliad*, since they do not seem to allow enough for the differing scales of artistic and literary operation: however elaborately decorated a pot may be, and however big, the decoration can be completed in a comparatively short time, and once complete it is visible as a whole, whereas, even if we suppose that the poet composed the *Iliad* inwards from its two ends, the intended effect was a linear one (and one to be produced, too, not all in a moment but over a long period of hearing). In any case, all these 'geometries' (especially Whitman's elaborate diagram) split on the same rock: they can be produced only by jiggery-pokery—half a line (or even sometimes a single epithet) on one side has to be balanced against a whole episode on the other, or a whole book has to be condemned as a Pisis-tratean 'interpolation' (so Whitman with the *Doloneia*) in order to get the figures to balance at all. This sort of thing may look all right on paper, but it is nonsense in the context of the poem (and particularly in the poem as performed to its audience).

Hopeful aspirants may take heart; neither Webster nor Whitman has extracted the last grains of academic gold from Homer—though someone may have to clear away the 'spoil' which Whitman has inadvertently shovelled back into the diggings.

University of Leeds

J. A. DAVISON

## WAS PINDAR PIOUS?

ERICH THUMMER: *Die Religiosität Pindars*. (Commentationes Aenipontanae.) Pp. 137. Innsbruck: Universitätsverlag Wagner, 1957. Paper, ö.S. 145.

THIS is a diligent investigation of a subject hardly to be cleared up by purely objective examination. That Pindar says much of gods and goddesses, of fate and chance, of the relations between mankind and the powers above, and speaks more than once of the destiny of the human soul after death is patent to anyone who even glances through his surviving works; but the question how much real personal feeling goes with all this and how much is to be attributed to the conventions of his art and a natural desire to be agreeable to his patrons can in the long run be answered only by the impression made on the reader, of sincerity or otherwise. The reviewer, for example, feels that the eschatology of the second Olympian ode is something which Pindar at all events found very interesting, and likely enough to be true, or him to use it in addressing an ailing man, and that much the same applies to frs. 114, 116, 127 Bowra; which of course does not amount to a proof that he was a convinced Orphic, or

Pythagorean, or whatever name we choose to give to the interesting theological speculations of that age. Further, it is at least plausible to hold that when Pindar says (*P.* 8. 57–60) that he has had a vision of the hero Alkmeon, he means it, and therefore that he was capable of subjective impressions such as are recorded of the deeply religious of all ages and faiths. But others may, and do, accord far less weight to these and many other passages and allow the poet hardly more than a decorous outward respect for the deities then in vogue.

Thummer begins with an elaborate review of the chief works on Pindar's religion known to him; it is strange that he does not include Farnell's essay on the subject (pp. 459–76 of vol. ii of his edition of Pindar). They reach between them almost every possible shade of interpretation. He then (pp. 54–64) sketches the political background of the epinikian odes and next (pp. 65–90) deals with 'Gottesnähe', starting from *N.* 6. 1 ff., the opening words of which he takes to mean 'ein einziges Geschlecht ist das der Menschen und Götter', of course one of the two possible ways of understanding it, and points out, quite rightly, how often Pindar brings the men he praises into as close contact as possible with gods, whether ancestral or not. Now (pp. 90–109) he turns to consider destiny or fate, including its relation to the power of the gods; I doubt if he is right in starting from the proposition that *μοῖρα* is independent originally of the deities, and perhaps he makes somewhat too sharp a distinction between *δαίμονες* ('das ungreifbare Göttliche') and *δαίμων* ('eine wesensmäßig mit dem Menschen verbundene Macht'), p. 97; although these meanings do belong to the words in many passages. The chapter as a whole is thoughtful and, like the work in general, reasonable; here and elsewhere many footnotes argue shrewdly for the interpretations he favours and against the views of others, especially aberrant and 'cranky' opinions such as have been put forward from time to time. After destiny comes righteousness or justice (*Recht*, pp. 109–20), and here notice should be taken especially of his very ingenious treatment (p. 117) of the famous fragment (152 Bowra), *νόμος ὁ πάντων βασιλεύς*, with the mention of Geryon in fr. 70. *O.* 2 receives full treatment on pp. 121–30, and there follows a very good summary of his general interpretation of Pindar (pp. 131–4). Writing for an aristocracy whose political importance was declining, the poet was concerned to emphasize that in one respect at least their position was secure and unshakable; the gods approved and favoured their 'just' behaviour, justifying on occasion in them acts which would not be approved in a common man. Thummer's last word, however, is that this does not warrant us in supposing that Pindar's was really a deeply pious nature, though he allows that he was capable of 'serious theological reflection'.

No two careful readers of so difficult an author are likely to agree in all their interpretations of him. Quite apart from the general question of Pindaric piety, I find several passages in which I doubt Thummer's exegesis. Thus, p. 59, I do not think that *I.* 5. 21 proves that Pindar himself went to Aigina for the performance of the ode; he may very well be speaking in the person of the chorus-leader. *P.* 66, n. 1, so far from branding the scholiast's interpretation of *Πύλω* in *Il.* v. 397 as 'fälschlich', I think it the only one which makes good sense. On p. 107, if I do not misunderstand him, he lays too much stress on the preposition in *ἀντιτυχόντα*, *N.* 7. 42; the verb means no more than 'meet', *N.* 4. 91. On p. 123, I cannot agree with the remark about 'das Lied, dem hier die Vorrangstellung gegenüber der Melodie zugewiesen wird', with reference to *O.* 2. 1. The ode and the air to which it was sung form a single whole; if it



is given precedence over anything, it is the instrumental accompaniment (*ἀναξίφορμυγες ὕμνοι*). Against such disagreements I would set a number of good interpretations to be found throughout the work.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

## PINDAR'S PAEANS

STEFAN LORENZ RADT: *Pindars Zweiter und Sechster Paian*. Pp. 36 (text); iii + 215 (commentary). Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 1958. Paper, fl. 20.

PAEANS 2 and 6 have been chosen, as being relatively well preserved, for thorough treatment. The main emphasis is naturally on the commentary, but Radt has made a careful collation of the papyri, and pp. 1-12 give a useful survey of the problems they present. On left-hand pages facing the text is a transcript of the papyri, with complete record of accents and punctuation marks and an apparatus of doubtful readings. While the text is in general that of Snell, there is a number of differences in detail and in colometry: at 6. 109 the established *Τομάρον* is rejected as inconsistent with the indications of the papyrus. The scholia are edited separately, divided and numbered as in Drachmann, and with an apparatus of their own. A translation precedes the commentary.

This is on a large scale—some 150 pages to 12 (fragmentary) pages of text—and is certainly exhaustive. That it is only rarely exhausting as well is due to the editor's marked powers of clear and orderly exposition. He displays an intimate familiarity with his author and a thorough command of the relevant literature which make his notes continuously informative and interesting; he sets out the views of his predecessors fairly and fully (sometimes indeed at undue length); his own judgements are clear and independent; and he certainly supersedes all previous treatments of these poems.

Radt thinks the wars referred to in Paean 2 must be against the Thracians, and that no more precise dating than 'after the Persian wars' is certain. At 29 he makes a third with Verrall and Jurenka in retaining *ἔτεκον*, but presents a new view: the first person is the Chorus, speaking as representatives of the people of Abdera; therefore, as elsewhere in Pindar, their 'mother' is Abdera and their 'mother's mother' not Athens but Teos; the Abderites are claiming that despite the youth of their city they have refounded Teos, an event which, though not certainly recorded, Radt thinks is implied by Strabo (xiv. 644) and Herodotus (i. 168, vi. 8). He makes nothing of the difficulty (surely very real) of supposing that Pindar could use such a phrase as *ματρός μάτερα ἔτεκον*. At 35 (as at 6. 121) there is an excellent note on the problems of the refrain. At 73 Radt agrees that the words *ἀλλὰ . . . στρατόν* quote the oracle, but argues that the preceding narrative reached its climax at the end of the triad with the mention of Melamphyllion (a victory), and that the oracle refers to the impending war and is the ground for the Abderites' confidence (105): hence the future *φύρσει* (a euphemism for 'slay'). *ποτὶ πολὺν στρατόν* (= the Abderites) must depend on *μολόντα*, and the Abderites are promised superior forces.

In his preliminary discussion of 6 Radt rightly stresses that it is unlikely that the Aeginetans took especial offence at the ambiguous words of 118 (*μυριάων περὶ τιμῶν*): the narrative, concentrating on the glorification of Apollo, pays



little regard to its effect on Neoptolemus' reputation and contains much to offend the Aeginetans. The unity of the poem Radt (following Sitzler and Puech) finds in the parallel between the famine of 65, averted by the prayers of the Delphians, and the drought relieved by the intercession of Aeacus, to whom a large part of the final triad was probably devoted; possibly the two disasters were one and the same. As regards date Radt rejects Wilamowitz's attempt to link this Paean with *P.* 6 and accepts Theiler's and J. H. Finley's view that the style and tone of *N.* 7 and *Pa.* 6 set them later—possibly at Herman's date of 467; too little seems to be made of Wilamowitz's objection that *Δωριεὶ μεδέουσα πόντῳ* (124) could hardly be possible at such a date.

8: *αἶών* (aorist) is not 'heard that': *ψόφον* is its direct object; Pindar 'heard the sound of Castalia bereft of human (*ἀνδρῶν*) choir', i.e. he was already at Delphi when he learnt of the need for this Paean. (The scholium here, stating that the Cephissus flows into Castalia, provokes an interesting note and excursus on this belief.) 54: Jurenka's *ἴσθ' ὅτι*, is read, with comparison of *Iliad* ii. 484 ff. 117 ff.: like Verrall Radt rejects Housman's *κυριῶν* (because it could not have given offence), virtually ignoring the *νομιζομένων* of sch. *N.* 7. 94a. Like Verrall, too, he keeps *μυριῶν* from that scholium, but rejects the mistranslation 'enormous payment', seeing rather a reference to the 'countless offerings' made at the festival, the disposal of which (the cause of the quarrel which led to Neoptolemus' death) he was to oversee after death—the *πομπαὶ πολύθυτοι* of *N.* 7. 46.

A 9-page appendix on the meaning of *ἔμπαν* (2. 29) argues forcibly, against Aristarchus, Brugmann, and Schwyzler, that the word always = *ὅμως*, never *ὁμοίως*.

Among the few small slips noticed only the following might cause trouble: p. 40, l. 21: for 134 Dr. read 143; p. 105, n. 2: for P. 4, 291 read O. 12, 12; p. 123, l. 24: for P. 9 read P. 3.

Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge

H. T. DEAS

## ANACREON

BRUNO GENTILI: *Anacreon*. Pp. xliii + 218; 1 plate (hitherto unpublished fragment of *crater* by Cleophrades). Rome: Edizioni dell' Ateneo, 1958. Cloth, L. 4,000.

THIS edition has great merits. The collection of fragments is complete (I myself should exclude 37—*Anacreontea*, surely—179, 183, and should include Himer. *or.* 29. 22 and 69. 35 Colonna, both apparently referring to poems otherwise unknown); all *testimonia* are quoted, most verbatim; the manuscript readings are (with few exceptions) fully reported; references and contexts are copied with quite exceptional accuracy; the texts of Anacreon are (with few exceptions) sound and sober; and an *index verborum* is supplied.

I. pp. ix–xxx Introduction. (a) Life, themes, and art of Anacreon: only 16 pp., but much is said, including sensitive and suggestive observations. (b) Textual tradition: Gentili argues that Hephaestion used Aristarchus' edition, and that this arranged Anacreon's books, like Sappho's, on metrical principles. Tetrameters and dimeters distinguished, making two books each of ionica and trochaica, perhaps also of iambica; add one book (the first) of glyconeia, one of mixed metres (P. Oxy. 2321), one of Partheneia (?), one of elegies, = 9 or 10 Books. The problem is too complex to be discussed here: but Crinagoras in

A.P. ix. 239, even without the second couplet, surely presupposes common knowledge that the number of Anacreon's lyrical books was *five*; and there are too many uncertain factors in Gentili's calculation. (c) A very few notes on dialect: little over a page on this fundamental question, yet 40 pp. are given at the end of the book to matter which might have been left to periodicals. Gentili rejects the few examples of  $\bar{a}$  for  $\eta$ , and rightly observes that there is no reliable evidence for Aeolic forms (84. 2 χρυσοφαεινῶν in an otherwise corrupt quotation, even if we trusted Lucian or his tradition). He aims at conforming to Alexandrian practice even where we know this to be an inaccurate representation of Anacreon. Here the most embarrassing question for the editor is the choice between  $\epsilon\omicron$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon$ : we know that Anacreon spelt  $\epsilon\omicron$  (pronounced  $\bar{\epsilon}\omicron$ ), but the relatively late spelling  $\epsilon\upsilon$  was adopted by the Alexandrians. Again, the Alexandrians adopted *spiritus asper*, surely foreign to Anacreon. No policy is perfect, and Gentili can plead the merit of consistency. On one point, the last of his few dialect-items, I should not follow him: inscriptions (Teian included) show that  $\epsilon + \epsilon\iota$  in Ionic =  $\epsilon\iota$  not  $\epsilon\epsilon\iota$ . Papyri fluctuate: P. Oxy. Anacr. 2321 δοκέει but 2322 φρονειν; Archil. 2310 φιλεειν but also ]θεῖ; Archil. 2313 prefers -εεῖ, thrice—but in the third example, where P. Lond. 487 B overlaps, we find τελειν; Anon. 2319 -εεῖς. As for  $\epsilon + \omicron\iota$ , evidence is insufficient, but indicates  $\epsilon\omicron\iota$  not  $\omicron\iota$ ; certainly  $\epsilon + \omega$  =  $\epsilon\omega$  not  $\omega$ . (d) p. xxx draws attention to a special feature of the edition—Gentili's collation of Et. Gen. A and the hitherto unused Et. Vat. gr. 1708, s. xii ex. I wish that he had told us more about this; 'mixtum et genuinum' is not precise enough. It seems never to be the sole source for a fragment; but it is obviously of interest, and it is most unfortunate that Gentili does not copy out its contexts in full. The same is true of Et. Gen. A: this is the most important of all the etymological sources, but Gentili seldom gives us a full context (except where Reitzenstein had done so); we are left to wonder whether Et. Gen. A has the references to Anacreon at, for example, 145 and 162.

II. pp. xxxi–xli *Librorum conspectus*. *Editiones*: inexplicable omission of Fulvius Ursinus. *Dissertationes*: over 150 items, a very mixed lot. Gravest omission, Lobel, *C.Q.* xxi (1927), 51; Schneidewin might be more fully represented; Sitzler's *Bursian* reports included, Hiller's not; *Elem. Doctr. Metr.* ascribed to the wrong initials; I have a prejudice against the gen. pl. *Saxonorum*.

III. pp. 3–107 Text, Testimonia, App. Crit.: I make two criticisms of principle before passing to a few details. First, I suggest that *testimonia* should be confined (except occasionally for special reasons) to passages attesting the quotation: they should not include references which have or may have nothing to do with the text in question; e.g. on 44, Hesych. *κυνζοί*, on 13 Herodian and Et. Mag. *νήνις*, are not necessarily connected with these quotations at all; their place is in a commentary, not among *testimonia*. Secondly, it is questionable whether *comment* should be included in an app. crit., especially in a book which makes no claim to offer a systematic exegesis. It is useful to have (separately, before or after app. crit.) references to articles which thoroughly discuss the text, and in the light of which the text as printed may be justified; but often more harm than good is done by brief statements of opinion on controversial points; mere reference to *loci similes* is seldom helpful and sometimes useless; no worthy purpose is served by copying out what is at everyone's hand (e.g. 33. 2 ἀνυστω: we are told to compare three other Greek passages, all listed by L.S.J.); and what is the point of such a note as that on 119. 3 δισκεῖν: 'θ 188

ἐδίσκεον ἀλλήλοισι confert Diehl? My objection really is that partial treatments and scraps of information may often be actually misleading; they are no substitute for what is really needed, a proper commentary. Now for some details.

**2.** 2 'κυμα ἀσπιδας (Et. Mag.) cod. D': cod. D has κυμα<sup>μ</sup> ἀσπιδ<sup>δ</sup>. Here, as generally throughout, Et. Sym. is not distinguished from Et. Mag.; yet Et. Sym. has a number of individual readings of interest. **3** Add: Eust. has Σμερ-δίη. **6** Λευκίππης surely wrong: -ων and -η codd., -ην Hoffmann plausibly. **7.** 3 βαρύνει βαρὺ intolerable; obelize 3-5. **12** Bergk not Wil. first suggested present tense. **15.** 1 Epitom. omits ὦ and later has οὐ γὰρ οἶδας. **16** Et. Sym. is significantly different here. **17.** 2 'κοιλώτερα codd.': no, κοιλότερα. **19** Important that Testim. (I) should be extended down to οἱ ἀρχαῖοι. **20** Et. Gud. has γείτονα (twice) acc. to Sturz. **21** On μυθιῆται here, Lobel, C.Q. l.c. Note on v. 2: schol. Hom. has ἱρὸν not ἱερὸν acc. to Dindorf. **22.** 1 φιλέοιεν first Schneide- win not Gentili. **33.** 6 δηῦτε first Mehlhorn not Bergk. **44.** 1 Et. Gen. B κνίζει not -η. **45** 'θύρησι iam alii': first so far as I know *vir doctus* ap. Fischer (ed. 3) p. 462; v. 2, κατεῦδει should be in text or note. **47.** 2 -οιο unique in Anacr.'s lyrics, and -ου is in Strabo (and Eust.). Read ὀχάνον χεῖρα, and consider Edmonds's τέθειμαι for τιθέμενοι. **52.** 2 'τε add. Gaisford': the new Teubner does not agree. In v. 1 ξείνοισιν ἐστὲ G.; the essential transposition was first made by Barnes. **60.** 4 δόμοισι is unmetrical: -σιν (which is what Lloyd-Jones suggested) is required. Note on v. 6: 'ἀπτάλλειν pap.': no, it is a misprint in the first edition—the facsimile shows αὐτάλλειν clearly. **65.** 4 ἐρωτᾷ, | is un- metrical. **66** It is characteristic of Gentili's thoroughness that he has noticed a discrepancy between transcript and facsimile in P.Oxy. 2321 fr. 7. He has followed the facsimile; but Mr. Lobel tells me that the transcript is correct, the facsimile inexplicably erroneous. **71**, last note: the unspeakable ἄρ' ἤκης should be annihilated. **74** κοῦρα is not just a conjecture: we need a reference to schol. T Hom. *Il.* iii. 130. **76** is corrupt: all the more need for what is lacking here, a full report of what is in cod. L. **77** codd. have -μίξ-. **79** Et. Sym. differs (δέμε). **80** Add: διὰ μέσσην ἔκοψε δειρήν Hoffmann, to the great comfort of the dialect. **81** ὠρικὴν is a bad choice. Add: Et. Sym. σείοντα. **82.** 12 Add symbol for lacuna (where ταῖς ἀβραῖς would be unmetrical). **83** κούφης, not κούφαις, is the proper spelling in Anacreon. Readings of Aristoph. codd. are not at all fully given here (see White's edition). The reference to Julian should be extended to include πρὸς Ὀλυμπον. **84** '〈ὄς〉 Cr(usius)': Bergk before him, *Anacr.* (1834), p. 124. Text corrupt, so codd. here should have been more fully reported. **87** Add to *testimonia*: Choerob. in *Theod.* i 104 Hilg. **93** Add to *testimonia*: Apostol. *cent.* viii 68 c. **96** Metre impossible. 'μαγάδην iam Fischer': and Barnes before him. **99** *Testim.* (II) add: ' = Zonar. s.v. ἀβάκησαν'. **105** φεύγω ὥστε: -- ∪ and -- ∪ -- ∪ alike impossible. **106** ἀργυρέη in text, 'ἀργυρῇ Cr.' in note; but we still have to go to Drachmann for the manuscript tradition. **107** Add: *Anacreonti adscriptis Hermann.* εἰσεις here and εἶσιν in **108** are, I believe, impossible scansiones in Anacreon: read οὐ δηῦ(τέ) μ' εἶσεις and ξείνοισιν εἶσιν. **111** We ought to be told that cod. has εἶσι and κυδοίοιο. **115** καθῶνα should be in text or note. **117.** 1 δὲ Bekker, καὶ cod. **118** Metre very improbable. **119** Divide at γάρ not φη. Schol. T Hom. misreported, has φηδιν not φη. **122** Read κοίμισον, not the metreless κοίμησον. Omit ὦ, which is not in the tradition μισῶ Ζεῦ in cod. 489 Villosion is a corruption of <κοί>μισον Ζεῦ. The reference to Villosion is given as ii. 77; so also Bergk and Edmonds; in my copy it is ii. 177, and so also Diehl. 'κοιμίζω

translate *adhibitum apud grammaticos tantum exstat*: L.S.J. quote *exx.* from classical poetry and prose. **123** Wilamowitz's reckless *ὥς* for codd. *ὥς* *ἂν* *δεῖ* stands in the text; Hoffmann did much better. **124** The text, unmetrical as it stands, should be obelized. Add Hoffmann's conjecture *πλέξαντες* <υ υ - υ - > | *μηροῖσιν πέρι μηρούς*. **155** *Testim.* 'Schol. Hom. Townl.': yes, but also schol. A, ii 149 Dindorf.

IV. pp. 108-15 *Prosodia et Metra*. Unsatisfactory to me, because I do not believe in these volatile *reiziana*; e.g. οὐδ' ἀργυρῇ κω τότ' ἔλαμπε πειθῷ is simply ia. cho. ba., anything but '- - reiz., υ υ - reiz.' I could occupy my whole space in objections to these few pages.

V. pp. 116-21 *Num. Tabulae*. VI. pp. 122-35 *Index verborum*, not quite perfect. Add from the Papyri **66**. 2 *βίος*, **66**. 4 *δυσπορ*[, **70**. 3 *ἐνθα*]. Conjectures are included without warning (*ἀήταις ἴσχεις ὄνειρον ὠρικὴν*), while the manuscript tradition may be omitted (**7**. 4 *κατάγουσι* the primary source; **17**. 1 *μὴν* all codd.; **81** *Θρηκίην* Et. Mag.). Bathyllus is in, Polycrates is not. Xanthippus **178**, Cypris **175**, Dionysus **128**, **174**, Critias **180**, are not indexed.

VII. pp. 136-175 Italian translation. VIII. pp. 176-218, an appendix on P.Oxy. 2321-2.—2321 fr. 1: the reconstruction is necessarily a chain of guesses, the sense depending on the supplements. V. 4 *ἐν δόμοισιν* is speculative; v. 5 *μήτηρ* is certainly not 'parola inevitabile e insostituibile'; ignorance of what ended v. 6 is an insuperable obstacle to interpretation of what follows; nor can the fourth stanza be understood, since we are reduced to guessing at the antecedent to *δεῖ ἄσσα*. Among the more improbable features of Gentili's reconstruction are his beliefs that there is no change of poem at v. 13 and that the subject of v. 3 is a female. 2321 fr. 4: the reconstruction presupposes the lack of only one syllable at the start of 1-2, 4-6; and there is no means of knowing whether this is true or not. In the detail: v. 5, the punctuation given by the text has to be ignored, and very doubtful metre is offered by *Δεύ]νυσε*. The obvious likelihood that a new poem begins at v. 7 is not admitted. 2322 fr. 1: useful observations on the style, and an attempt to show that a new poem begins at v. 15—the primary obstacle, the definite article in *τὴν ἀρίγνωτον γυναῖκα* at the alleged beginning, is surmounted by supposing reference to a well-known *hetaira*, the lofty epithet *ἀρίγνωτον* being 'di un' allusività non priva di malizia', admittedly quite in the manner of Anacreon. I still think it much likelier that there is only one poem, and that the *ἀρίγνωτος γυνή* is *Θρήκη*, driven to jump into the sea (like her mother before her; hence the address to her mother here) on hearing about the deed of Thracian Smerdis, whose hair was the glory of his motherland, and whom one could not dissuade from cutting it off 'even on behalf of *Θρήκη*'.

I have made a few criticisms of detail, but am much more concerned to stress the positive merits of the edition: it offers in attractive form a complete survey of the tradition, useful to all and indispensable to some of us.

Misprints are wonderfully rare: pp. xxxiv-v *Lyrik* for *Lyric*, twice; p. 21 Hyppolytos; p. 39 *Texgesch.*; p. 95 *Αθηβίαν*; p. 188 *λάβρη* (for *λάθρα*); p. 203 *γεύγων*.

## SAPPHO

MANUEL F. GALIANO: *Safo*. Pp. 90. Madrid: Fundación Pastor de Estudios Clásicos, 1958. Paper, 75 ptas.

GALIANO describes his work as 'the first chapter of a series entitled "the Discovery of Love in Greece"'. The reader may find something too nebulous in the first ten pages (pp. 6-15: e.g. p. 9, we are not to say that Sappho *writes* of love, but that she *is* love, 'love in every poem, in every line, in every word'; p. 13, Lesbos is said to be the 'natural guardian of the Hellespont'; p. 14, an imaginative reconstruction of the atmosphere of seventh-century Lesbos); but let him by all means persevere, for the reward comes soon and is considerable. On p. 17 the right question is asked: what exactly was it which attracted women from overseas to Sappho's society, and what exactly did they do there? There is nothing new in Galiano's method or conclusions: he examines the fragments, and finds—like others before him—that they tell a plain tale, at least in outline; but it must be said at once that the examination has not hitherto been conducted in such detail, and the conclusions have never been more clearly stated. For some reason (the alleged historical-social causes, pp. 63 f., are disputable) Lesbian society at this time was specially fertile ground for the growth of associations of young women: and the magnet which attracted them was, in a word, Love; in Mytilene they found strange freedom to indulge their emotions, and to express those emotions in song. There is then no great mystery if Sappho, in such circumstances, exerted more magnetic force than others. Galiano is no more able than I am to discover evidence for any *formal* relation between Sappho and her girls: he can find no priestess of a cult, no president of an academy. These women came together to live in gentle easy friendship, enjoying simple womanly comforts and pleasures, and expressing their loves and hates, their desires and deeds, in poetry. Galiano recognizes with most delicate and just appreciation the strength and quality of the love which united them: we should expect, and shall certainly find, that it was by no means wholly spiritual; but there is not much profit in pursuing that part of the inquiry farther, and Galiano is somewhat impatient with those who look for traces of *verdadera pasión carnal y pecaminosa*. It is unlikely that such traces should ever have been left ('the most elementary sense of shame will always set a limit to candour'); in any case we must not judge Sappho's behaviour by modern moral standards; and in any case the conclusion should not affect our judgement of her poetry. Still, he reviews the evidence in detail, and comes to the inevitable conclusion that there is no absolutely unambiguous trace—except *ὀλιγβ-* in fr. 99. i. 5; and that is said to be a doubtful reading. In fact there is no reasonable doubt about *-λιγβ-*, and the first letter was almost certainly *ο*.

Galiano has read widely in modern psychological studies of his subject (including 'esos dos resonantes libros de Kinsey'); and others may find this part of his work more convincing than I do. There is slight evidence for her 'hatred and contempt' of males; there is surely little if any *ironía sangrienta* in the scraps of Epithalamian verse; we do not know that her marriage was 'ephemeral', or that her husband 'left no riches behind him', or that 'thereafter men disappear for ever from her life'; we do not know that Sappho's mother died early, leaving her to bring up three younger brothers; the theory of *homosexualismo por reacción* is not at all firmly founded.

The footnotes are at least as important as the text. There are 322 of them, attesting exceptionally wide reading and profound consideration of the extant fragments. The most amusing (and least important) section is pp. 32-48, an exhaustive account, with very full notes, of Sappho in modern literature: this is an astonishing assembly of names and references, of no value whatsoever for the understanding of Sappho, but entertaining in itself, a remarkable *tour de force*. In the detailed notes on the more important fragments there is much that is useful, inevitably a certain amount that is open to question. In general, the measure of agreement between us is great, not only in the total picture of Sappho, but also in the interpretation of individual pieces. On two important points, however, I believe reconsideration is needed.

(a) p. 66, on fr. 1: I do not understand how Galiano could find a 'capricious coquette' in my portrait of Sappho. He himself does not suppose that she was perpetually faithful in devotion to one girl. And all I say is that in this poem, while there is 'no want of sincerity', yet 'in the moment of her agony she has the wit to understand and the heart to express the vanity and impermanence of her passion'; here is no *veleta amorosa*, no *caprichosa coqueta*. And when I assign to the threefold  $\delta\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  the natural and normal meaning of these words, Galiano must not quote against me Hermann Fraenkel's interpretation, *wieder und wieder muß die Göttin ihr helfen in gleicher Not*, for that is precisely what I say it means.

(b) pp. 82 f., on  $\delta\epsilon\delta\upsilon\kappa\epsilon\ \kappa\tau\lambda.$ : it comes as a great surprise to find Galiano entertaining the idea that these are Sappho's verses, in spite of dialect, metre, style, and the want of any ancient authority for the ascription. There is nothing in any of the alleged imitations to support the theory: in particular, the reference to *Heroides* 15. 155-6 is most misleading. *Sappho desertos cantat amores* could at once be referred (if it were necessary) to one of many among the extant fragments; and the following phrase, *ut media cetera nocte silent*—which has, by the way, no counterpart in the *adespoton*—belongs exclusively to the context of the Ovidian poem.

But I shall not end on a querulous note. This book (which is much longer and solidier than the mere number of pages would suggest) is an important contribution to its theme, the nature of love in Sappho; well-informed, thoughtful, and constructive. It will retain its value for a long time, and future editors of Sappho and writers about her will do well to read and re-read it with close attention.

Trinity College, Cambridge

D. L. PAGE

## THE LOEB AESCHYLUS

Aeschylus. With an English translation by HERBERT WEIR SMYTH. Vol. ii. Reprinted with an Appendix edited by HUGH LLOYD-JONES. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. 611. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

ONE of the most valuable features of Weir Smyth's Loeb Aeschylus is the full treatment of the fragments. In reprinting vol. ii the editors have had two good ideas—to add an appendix 'containing the more considerable fragments published since 1930' and to entrust its preparation to Mr. Lloyd-Jones. In accordance with Weir Smyth's principle, only those fragments are printed of which 'at least one entire verse, or two connected half-verses, is preserved'.



Lloyd-Jones does not include the Milan fragment (Mette, *Nachtrag*, p. 33), since he sees 'no positive reason for ascribing this piece to Aeschylus'. He does include—wisely, if illogically—two fragmentary hypotheses of particular interest. (The hypothesis to the *Philoctetes* is mentioned in a footnote.) A revised, and improved, text of fr. 50 W.S. (99 N<sup>2</sup>) is given as an addendum.

In presenting the fragments Lloyd-Jones follows the same general method as Professor Page in his *Greek Literary Papyri*. The bibliographies are full. The introductory notes, which in some cases (e.g. *Diktyoukoi* and *Isthmiastai*) run to considerable length, are lucid, fair, and cautious. There are many new supplements.<sup>1</sup> The reader is warned not to take these otherwise than as an indication of how the complete text may have run: they are often, though not always, superior to previous suggestions. The non-specialist reader is given a reasonably full, if simplified, statement of the palaeographical facts. The aim was clearly to make the fragments as readable as might be without misleading the reader, and a large number of *ad hoc* decisions must have been required. It might perhaps have been mentioned (in 'Aids to the Reader') that the *absence* of a subscript dot does not necessarily mean that the letter is 'certainly read', though in many cases it may certainly have been written. (fr. 275, 772 αὐὲν should not have been printed without any indication of uncertainty.) Nor are letters which have been supplied always bracketed.<sup>2</sup> More careful proof-reading would have picked up a bracket missing in fr. 282, 19 and a bracket reversed in fr. 277, 16. In fr. 284, 13 the letters are too far to the left and there is an intrusive paragraphos. In fr. 276, 23 ποθ' has somehow got itself printed instead of ἀρ'. These, however, are minor imperfections in a most useful piece of work most competently carried out. I add a few observations on points of interest.

**274-5** (*Diktyoukoi*). Dictys is made the *second* speaker—'the more observant and less excitable'. Lloyd-Jones sees that Danae's prayer (773 ff.) must have been answered and rejects the improbable equation of Dictys and Silenus. Many new supplements (by Lloyd-Jones, Page, and Maas) are offered between 765 and 785: that suggested for 767 implies that Danae had liberty of action, which seems unlikely. At 801 ἀποστερῶν and at 807 Page's εὐμενοῦς for εὐμενῆς are noteworthy. At 820 ἐντροφος should be ascribed to E. Harrison, not to Siegmann. **276** (*Isthmiastai*). Lloyd-Jones accepts 'but not without considerable misgivings' that the two sheets of papyrus are consecutive. (The third join is so good that this is the only sensible working hypothesis?)<sup>3</sup> He shows that Snell's identification of the donor of the masks and (?) javelins with Sisyphus, though it 'might possibly be right', rests upon rather tenuous evidence. His own very ingenious guess is that Hephaestus, often associated with satyrs on vases (the Return of Hephaestus), is bribing the Chorus to give him a lift in their ship. This hypothesis is not without attractions, but a great deal of weight has to rest on 93—a line which is very uncertain in its detail and context. 24 is read as: οὐ τοῦτ' ἐρῶ σ', 'οὐ δῆλος ἦσθ' ὁδοιπορῶν', and Professor Dover's interesting suggestion that the words in inverted commas may come from a beast-fable of Archilochus is quoted. In translating 35 (χρήματα φθείρων ἐμά) the less convincing of the alternatives mentioned on p. 544 is adopted:

<sup>1</sup> Including some which are contributed by Maas and Page.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. fr. 275, 817; fr. 276, 21; fr. 280, 4; fr. 281, 4. In fr. 273, 2 the bracket should precede the last two letters of θέελλα.

<sup>3</sup> Not invalidated by the arguments of K. Reinhardt in *Hermes*, lxxxv (1957), 1 ff. This important article appeared too late to be taken into consideration in this edition.

the contrast with *βραχίονα* makes it highly probable that *χρήματα ἐμά* refers to *τὰ φαλλία*. At 67 Lloyd-Jones (with Mette and Snell) accepts Lobel's *σιδηρίτι[ν] τέχνην*: 'no good at work in iron'. But the contrast in 68 (where οὐδ' ἐνεῖμ' ἐν ἄρσεσιν is attractive) has nothing to do with *τέχνη*, and Kamerbeek's *μάχην* deserves consideration. At the end of 78 *τὰ φίλτατα* has several advantages. **277** (*Niobe*). Lloyd-Jones is inclined to believe that the speaker is not Niobe: at 7 he adopts Latte's *ἐπώζει ζωσα*, and himself supplies *θρηνοῦσα* at the beginning of 8. (But this implies too positive a content for any cries which may have punctuated the silence of Niobe?) The case for giving 10–13 to the Chorus is stronger than Lloyd-Jones allows. Even if the speech is continuous, *μῆνιν τίνα κτλ.* is better taken as an indirect than as a rhetorical question.<sup>1</sup> **280** (P.Oxy. 20. 2251). Miss Cunningham's attribution of this fragment to the *Aigyptioi* has greater plausibility than Lloyd-Jones admits, and his objections to it are far from fatal. (i) It can be argued on quite other grounds that the sons of Aegyptus were not the principal chorus of this play. (ii) Snell's supplements, which are admittedly preferable to Miss Cunningham's emendation, are quite consistent with her attribution.<sup>2</sup> **281** (P.Oxy. 20. 2256 fr. 8). The problem of 7 f. is discussed at length and *ἀμπολᾶς*—one of Lobel's suggestions—adopted. In 5 Lloyd-Jones suggests that the right reading is *ἐκπαγλουμένη* in the sense of 'magnify'. **282** (P.Oxy. 20. 2256 fr. 9a). Lloyd-Jones is not impressed by Fraenkel's attribution of this fragment to the *Aetnaeae* (or *Aetnae*). He mentions that *δότη* points to its coming from a satyr-play, but does not discuss this question further. It is of course important for any bearing that the fragment may have on Aeschylean theology. Lloyd-Jones does not embark upon this controversial theme, but refers to his article in *J.H.S.* lxxvi. At 19 *σώφρονας φύω φρένας* (Lloyd-Jones) and at 20 *πειθοῦς* (Maas) are noteworthy; at 32 *θυμοῖδης* is well explained. **284** (P.Oxy. 20. 2256 fr. 71). A case for attributing this fragment to the *Philoctetes* is stated. One may doubt, however, whether the chorus of Lemnians would have been, as to Ajax, so well informed or so partisan and, as to Philoctetes, apparently so agitated. **285** (?*Herakleidae*). Lloyd-Jones is inclined to believe, with Srebrny, that this fragment describes the death of Heracles, and he prints the text with (improved) supplements along Srebrny's lines. He points out, however, that 'even a play that dealt with the same subject as Euripides' *Heracleidae*, or with a different subject altogether, might have included a description of the death of Heracles in the past tense'.<sup>3</sup> And in the first person, for *μ'* alone fits the gap in 4. Substantial doubt remains whether this fragment is really Aeschylean. On the attribution to Aeschylus of 262 (?*Myrmidones*) Lloyd-Jones is sceptical, if slightly less so than Page (*Greek Literary Papyri*). **288** (The Danaid Hypothesis). The implications are clearly set out. 'In the light of the evidence as it now stands, it is perverse to proceed on any other assumption' than a date in the sixties, perhaps 464. The difficulties involved in interpreting the non-Aeschylean titles might have been more clearly stated.

King's College, London

R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM

<sup>1</sup> P.V. 500–4 (*τίς . . . ;—οὐδέ τις*) is not a good parallel. P.V. 193 ff., on the other hand, might be used to support the attribution of these lines to the Chorus.

<sup>2</sup> Since, if Danaus became king, it is likely that Pelasgus' sons as well as himself perished in the battle. It may be thought

that certain passages in the *Supplikes* gain in irony if the whole house of Pelasgus is destroyed despite his piety: 433 ff., 413 ff., 26 f., and perhaps the corrupt 362 ff. However, I hope to deal with (i) and (ii) at some other opportunity.

<sup>3</sup> If *ἦν* is right in l. 2.

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS*

W. B. STANFORD: Aristophanes, *Frogs*. Edited with Introduction, Revised Text, Commentary, and Index. Pp. lx+211. London: Macmillan, 1958. Cloth, 10s. net.

THIS edition is designed for 'English-speaking students in schools and universities', the same readers whom Tucker, Stanford's predecessor in this series, had in mind when he edited the play in 1906. This definition of the prospective reader is a wide one: Stanford gives more elementary help than Tucker: he marks difficult quantities in the notes, helps us with difficult verbs (e.g. 133 *εἶναι*, 920 *διήει*), and does more to assist the beginner with the translation. Nevertheless he sometimes lets him down: the student who wants a note on *εἶναι*, or needs to be told to note (468 *ἀπῆξας* . . . *ἀποδράς*) 'the regular *ās* in the first form and *ās* in the second', might well be glad of a grammatical note on 627 *χάπως*, etc., 789 *κάνεβαλε*, 813 *ἐσπουνδάκωσι*, and of assistance with the translation of, for example, 586, 611 *πρὸς*, 710 *ὅποσοι*, 1054 *παράγειν*, 1163. Similarly the reader for whom the thumb-nail historical sketch on pp. xv ff. is devised is unlikely to appreciate such things as the unexplained allusion to Eupolis' *Demoi* on 1431.

The more advanced reader, too, will find some cause for complaint. Although there is no continuous apparatus criticus, textual questions are sometimes discussed in the notes, but all too often, instead of a precise statement of the relevant evidence, we have a vague remark like 'the MSS. disagree'; the editor tends to state his own preferences without giving reasons for them, or sets out the opinions of some of his predecessors without giving the reader any guidance. That this is not the result of any consistent policy of avoiding excessive complexities is shown by the fact that some of the notes are exemplary, and meet both the above criticisms (e.g. on 369-70); and also because fragments of apparatus do keep turning up. They contain matter that is often unimportant and sometimes inaccurate: the statement that U omits 1324 is both: the manuscript which omits the line is V, and the fact is anyhow of no critical importance, as both 1323 and 1324 end with a *ὀρῶ* from Dionysus. In other respects, too, the notes could sometimes have been more precise; e.g. the note 'Xanthias rants like a tragedian' (19-20) is perhaps misleading, as is the allusion at 718 to the Spartan 'occupation of Attica' in 413, and at 1314 Stanford shows ignorance of musical terms. Nor is 'risk saying' an accurate translation of *ἀποκινδυνεύετον* . . . *λέγειν* at 1108. In particular, the treatment of particles leaves a good deal to be desired, e.g. 159 *γούν* is more likely to be the regular 'part proof' usage, 'at any rate', than 'then' = *γε* emphatic + *οὖν*; 556 *μὲν οὖν* with *οὐ* 'indicate a negative deduction from a preceding statement'; 'Oh so you didn't expect . . .', as in 1188' Stanford; but he interprets 1188 correctly as adversative. Surely *μὲν οὖν* is adversative in 556 too, as Denniston p. 475, classes it; 794 *γε* is limitative rather than 'explanatory'. Parallels quoted are sometimes misleading: 844 quotes 855 *ὕπ' ὀργῆς* as a parallel for *πρὸς ὀργήν*: at 995 neither of the two Aeschylus passages quoted for *ἐκτὸς* . . . *τῶν ἐλαῶν* mentions olive-trees: at 1004-5 to quote *Eq.* 89 for *κρουός* = 'spout' misses the emphasis on water as opposed to wine in that context.

The text, based on Coulon, contains few innovations. This is quite natural; to expect many plausible innovations would be to under-estimate greatly the

quality and quantity of work already done on the play. 178 is divided *ΔΙ. ὡς σεμνὸς . . .* *ΞΑ. οὐκ οἶμ.*; at 340 Stanford reads *ἐγείρε φλογέας λαμπάδας ἐν χερσὶ παρήκεις*, following Goligher (the note might have made clear the exact extent of Goligher's contribution); at 1144 he prints the conjecture *ἐκείνως*, which he proposed in *Hermathena* lxxxix, without, unfortunately, formulating any precise objections to the manuscript readings. One or two of the conjectures he seems to claim as original have been anticipated: 369 *τοῖς μὲν ἀπανδῶ* was suggested by Blaydes (he printed *τούτοις πραυδῶ* but mentioned *τοῖς μὲν ἀπανδῶ* as a possibility if one wanted to keep the triple *ἀπανδῶ*); 530 the punctuation proposed is the second of the two alternatives suggested by Tucker (and is implied by Blaydes in his commentary). One innovation is made tacitly, the continuing of 956–7 to Aeschylus. (None of the principal manuscripts has a change of speaker at the beginning of 958, though RV omit the change to Euripides at 956: but both manuscripts are very unsystematic in recording changes of speaker hereabouts.)

Naturally the text is often a matter of opinion. At 151–3 (where Stanford might have told us precisely what is the 'evidence in Σ for early objection to the position of 152–3') the 'double recension' hypothesis perhaps points the way to the best solution, as 151 and 152–3 seem mutually destructive in their effect. Possibly 151 and 153 (with *ῆ* for *τῆν*) are alternatives (spoken by Dionysus) and 152 an interpolation added to accommodate both 151 and 153 in the text. 1437 ff. are perhaps best explained along similar lines (possibly with 1442 at the head of both versions), one version consisting of the Palamedes-joke (1442, 1437–41, 1451–3), the other (1442–50) mocking Euripides' sophistry with opposites (as *Alc.* 521, *Hipp.* 1034). It is difficult, by the way, to accept the attribution of 1443–4 *ἄπιστα* and 1446–50 to Aeschylus: he would scarcely parody his rival's mannerisms here. (Stanford does not print it, but mentions it with approval in his note.) In each case both versions are probably Aristophanic: priority is impossible to determine.

Stanford sees the play as a play, and prefixes to each section a useful note on 'Action'. A few points invite comment: e.g. the 'Action' note on 209 ff. misses the point (which is made on p. xliii of the introduction) that the main rhythmic clash is between iambs and trochaics; Stanford might also have noted that the Frogs-scene corresponds to the battle-scene which is a regular feature of the *parodos*: this is emphasized by the verbal similarity between 268 and *Ach.* 347 (as correctly restored by Dobree). We might have had more on the interpretation of the major issues of the play, particularly Aristophanes' attitude to Euripides. How much serious criticism of the playwrights does the play contain? Are, for instance, the *Ληκύθιον* episode and the weighing-scene nothing but foolery? What is the dramatic significance of 52–80, or of the sudden change to a sharply anti-Euripidean tone at 1471, which lasts to the end of the play? (Stanford's note (1520), 'It was not the Greek custom to be kind to the vanquished', seems scarcely the whole story.) Does Aristophanes wish us to interpret his intimate knowledge of Euripides as a compliment? What light is thrown on the *Frogs* by scenes in other plays in which Euripides plays a part? What is the precise meaning of *σοφός* and *σοφία* in the play? (Aristophanes sometimes uses *σοφός* (e.g. 780) and *σοφία* (1519) as if they were the sole criterion of a poet, but this is plainly not so at 1413 and 1434, and elsewhere *σοφός* must mean 'clever' and is a characteristic of Euripides (e.g. *Thesm.* 21, and almost certainly *Ach.* 401). Partial answers to these questions are given in

the course of the commentary and in the introduction, but it would have been useful to have had the whole question treated more fully in a single discussion in the introduction.

The introduction, as it stands, is somewhat scrappy: too high a proportion of the space available is devoted to short sketches of 'background' which any student will be obtaining in more detail from other sources. In particular, the sections on Aristophanes' language and comic technique could have been dispensed with: the former does not distinguish between Aristophanes' personal idiosyncracies and features common to all Comedy and colloquial Greek, and is somewhat inaccurate: e.g. 'He allows himself more freedom than stricter Greek writers in the use of Elision' (p. xl) followed by examples of which about half are found in Tragedy, e.g. prodelision of ἐγώ, crasis (τάργυρον), and elision of οἶμοι (οἶμ' ὥς, Soph. *Ajax* 587); the latter, like its direct ancestor the Tractatus Coislinianus, does not amount to much more than that Aristophanes uses every type of humour. On the other hand, in an earlier section of the introduction, Stanford makes a good point in attributing this wide range to the need to please a mixed audience.

It is perhaps the failure to achieve this very object that is the root cause of the shortcomings of the present edition. It has some features of an elementary edition, some of an advanced one; but one cannot make the best of both worlds by omitting some of the information a beginner needs and compromising the standards of scholarship an advanced student expects. Stanford tells us in his preface that what he has published amounts to about a half of his first draft: perhaps something went wrong in the process of compression.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

## THE LOEB CALLIMACHUS

C. A. TRYPANIS: *Callimachus, Aetia, Iambi, Lyric Poems, Hecale, Minor Epic and Elegiac Poems, Fragments of Epigrams, Fragments of Uncertain Location*. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvi+318. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.

THERE is every reason why the modern reader should redress the injustice done to Callimachus by the romantic taste of the last century. New publications have greatly increased our knowledge of his work, and it is now clear that he was unfortunate in that the *Hymns*, rather than the *Aetia* or the *Hecale*, was for so long the single long work by which he could be judged. We should be grateful to Professor Trypanis for presenting to the general reader in a sensible and unpretentious way the results of Pfeiffer's great edition. He prints only 'those fragments which make sense and can be translated', and has wisely left all particulars of provenance for the reader who wants them to look up in Pfeiffer; he offers merely a concise apparatus criticus and brief explanatory notes. The text and apparatus contain a fair number of new supplements by E. A. Barber, P. Maas, and Trypanis himself. Few of these can be refuted, but few can be proved right; the most positive new gain to the text seems to me to be at fr. 186, 11, where J. D. P. Bolton restores Πελαγονικοῖσι Ἑλλοπιῆτες from Hesiod frs. 134 and 212. Trypanis claims no literary qualities for his translation, which he means only as an aid to the understanding of the text. In some places



it is not quite idiomatic; but on the whole it is a useful and accurate piece of work. It is a pity that when Trypanis comes to a mutilated passage that he omits, or to a gap in the text, he does not take more care to let the reader know *exactly* how much is missing. Even where he does give the number of lines supposed to be missing, the number is not always the correct one (see, for example, fr. 384, the Victory of Sosibius). Something has gone wrong at fr. 284 A, where the reader should carefully compare the setting-out of this amalgam of fragments with that given by Lobel in P.Oxy., vol. xxiii, pp. 89 f. ἵππους καὶ τάνετος ἀπ' Εὐρώταο κομίσσαι, κτλ., cannot have followed directly upon σκόλους ὀφθαλμοῖσι καὶ εἰ θέμις ὡμὰ πασαίμην, as it is made to do here. If each right-hand page had a headline, reference would be much facilitated.

Fr. 25: Barber's ἐπὶ τριπτήρα πιάσας is most attractive. 191, 71: the supplement οὐκ' ἔγωγ' ἄξω, which Pfeiffer (i. 504) withdrew but which Trypanis puts in the text, does not give the antithesis one would expect; Thales would more naturally begin, 'I thank you for your offer.' 141: for 'hypercatalectic', read 'brachycatalectic'. 202, 61: Trypanis's tentative supplement νόμους is less good than the others which he prints; the point must be that wealth deserts its former haunts or its former friends or masters. 222: the quality of Simonides here in question is not 'stinginess', but mercenariness. 251: ἄλις here means not 'enough', but 'in abundance', and to render ἐνικρύπτουσι by 'put away' is to obscure the reference to the ἄρτος ἐγκρυφίας. 384, 25: ἀμφοτέρω παρὰ παιδί is 'both the children', not 'the two sons'. 388, 9: Trypanis puts Maas's φανῆ in the text. But Maas himself now tells me he has second thoughts; could Callimachus have used this form in this poem? I had much sooner suppose that μέχρις κε was used here, even if only here, to mean 'so as', perhaps on the analogy of ἔως ἄν. But if I shared Trypanis's view, I should supplement μέχ]ρι in l. 10, even if the space seems small for three letters. 637: whoever looks carefully at the scholion on *Od.* ii. 134 which preserved this fragment will see that it has little point unless Telemachus' remark is being explained on the ground that (1) he is not yet sure that his father is dead, and (2) that even if he is, the wrath of the dead is dangerous (cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 4. 159 for μῆνις χθονίων in this sense). It follows that ἐπιχθονίων cannot be right; Bergk's ἐπι χθονίων might be, but I should prefer to read ἐπ(ε)ῖ χθονίων. 689: 'Pan the shepherd drill' I could not have understood without the Greek; 'the goatherds' screw' would better convey the sense.

P.Oxy. 2398 (supplementing fr. 260) appeared while the book was in proof, and is dealt with in an addendum printed opposite p. vi. Drawing attention to ἀλλεκαλ[ in l. 3 of the new fragment, Trypanis points out that the speaker whose speech ends at 260, 61 may be Hecale, and ingeniously suggests that the 'dry tree' of l. 52 may be the staff she is holding in her hand; he compares *Il.* i. 234 f. and quotes *Hecale* fr. 292 (there is also 355). But from l. 62 we learn that the person addressed, as well as the speaker, was female; what other female may Hecale have been addressing? Trypanis accepts the explanation of 51 f. that is given at *Ox. Pap.*, vol. xxiv, p. 98, but without referring to the passages on which it rests, which may be found in Gow's note on Theocritus 1. 102. He omits to mention the supplement [π]ω in l. 51, but as there is room for only two letters this seems unavoidable. Lobel, reading [π]ω, translated: 'For not yet for ever . . . not already having smashed pole and axle, do all the suns have their foot inside their setting-places.' This would make ἥματα πάντα an accusative of extent of time; but it would also be possible to take it as a nominative. In that



case one might suppose that the speaker began, 'For not yet are all days . . .'; then, instead of adding the obvious continuation 'at an end', interrupted herself with the oath that ends at the end of l. 52; and then, instead of finishing the interrupted sentence, began again with οὐκ ἤδη. I rather prefer this way of taking it.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

## THE LOEB PLUTARCH

HAROLD CHERNISS and WILLIAM C. HELMBOLD: Plutarch, *Moralia*. Vol. xii. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xii+590. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS extremely useful volume contains *De facie in orbe lunae* edited by Professor Cherniss, and a group of works edited by Professor Helmbold, of which *De sollertia animalium* is the most important. The volume goes to 999b, i.e. the end of *De esu carniū* ii. Professor Cherniss's notes and references make his part of the book a valuable contribution to the understanding of one of Plutarch's most difficult works, and one which has not always been fortunate in its editors. Some of his suggestions were already published (in *Classical Philology*, xlii [1951]), but there is much here that is new. With Pohlenz's new text, which was not available to Cherniss, discussion about *De facie* should now be greatly stimulated. The weakness of Cherniss's work lies in the translation, which is often needlessly clumsy, and—to the reviewer at least—far less felicitous and readable than Prickard's. Helmbold's work, conceived less ambitiously, includes fairly adequate annotation, and he has had useful help from Professor A. C. Andrews on zoological points. His text is less 'conservative' than the new Teubner, and he is surely right in this; but it is a pity that he was not able to use the materials assembled by Hubert both for the establishment of the text and for illustration.

Perhaps I may offer a few criticisms of detail.

p. 29. The bibliography on *De facie* should include the old Bohn translation by C. W. King, which contains some original ideas, and, if not as good as Prickard, is superior to Raingeard, with whom Cherniss deals with just severity. There are also some remarks on *De facie* in S. Sambursky, *The Physical World of the Greeks* (1956), chap. ix. p. 56, n. 3. May not ταῖς ἐκλείψεων be instrumental dative with ἀλίσκομένη? This would be more normal; but cf. not only the passage from Theo but datives with festivals, τοῖς Διονυσίοις and the like. p. 80, 16. παθῶν is indeed a possible κούη form (Blass-Debrunner, *N.T. Gram.* §48) but Plutarch apparently always has παθῶν elsewhere and so should be given it here. p. 94 (928d-e). Cherniss translates as though δόγματος depended on τὰς ἀποδείξεις, but presumably does not construe the sentence like this. However, to say that the δόγμα βαδίζει ἐπὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις does not seem very natural. The λόγος may do so (as with Pohlenz's βαδίζοντα) or Lucius may himself, and I suggest that this is most likely and we should read βαδίζοντι. p. 132, 5. The supplement <λέγειν> surely gives the wrong sense: <λήγειν> or <σωπᾶν>? p. 196, beginning of c. 28. Lamprias's question, as Pohlenz says, is a real one, not a rhetorical one. p. 214, 4. ὀρθῶς must go with λελέχθαι, not with ἡγοῦ. p. 292, 17. φασί probably draws attention to the quasi-proverbial phrase

ἐχθές καὶ πρῶτην and does not refer, as Helmbold's note implies, to some persons who are authorities for a version of the legend of Prometheus. p. 318, 2. Wyttenbach's transposition of ποιητήν and ἀγαθόν is necessary. p. 346, 13. An alternative remedy, perhaps easier, is to keep ἐτέραν but add <ἀν> after παντάπασιν. p. 400. Both Helmbold and Hubert in the new Teubner edition seem to have missed the charming description of nightingales teaching one another to sing in Pliny, *N.H.* x. 83. p. 450, 15. *Βουνῶν* is presumably from *Βουνοί* 'hills', which seems a likely enough local name: Helmbold's acceptance of C. O. Müller's *Βουλίδος* is odd. p. 504, 9. No need to suspect οἷς δῆ. p. 504, 17. *Ἀκούεις* is idiomatic: see, for example, *Gorgias* 503c and other examples in Kühner-Gerth i. 135 ff. p. 515, on 989c: reference to *Od.* xix. 225 has been accidentally omitted. p. 520, 10. *ὕμῶν* 'you men', not 'your men'.

This volume contains an exceptional amount of useful material and ideas. As the Loeb *Moralia* progresses, it becomes more ambitious; and in Cherniss's work on *De facie* it reaches a very high level indeed.

St. John's College, Oxford

D. A. RUSSELL

## THE LOEB AELIAN

A. F. SCHOLFIELD: *Aelian, On Animals*. With an English translation. Vol. i (Books i-iv). (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxix+359. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS volume shows knowledge and precision, and promises well for those that are to come. Aelian is not the most presentable of Greek authors, and Mr. Scholfield is to be congratulated on the skilful handling of his introduction, the phrasing and tone of which are impeccable throughout. An excellent characterization of Aelian as an author is followed by a masterly summary of the evidence relating to his sources; and finally there is a brief reference to Aelian's influence in later times as exemplified in the medieval bestiary. Here a slightly fuller account would have been welcome. Incidentally, it would have been of some interest to know the extent to which Aelian is considered responsible for contributing to our common stock of ideas such clichés as 'the King of Beasts', 'raven locks', 'a white elephant'. The editor may feel that such a problem of transmission calls for a special study; and he is no doubt right.

The text, we are told, 'is substantially that of Hercher's edition of 1864'. This was a revision of the Didot text of 1858, in connexion with which Hercher had elaborated criteria for detecting the glosses and interpolations which he proceeded to exclude. The editor pays a tribute to Hercher's work. He is, however, rather less dependent on him than his unassuming statement might imply. There are about six passages in the present volume where the manuscript reading is preferred to Hercher's, and in the text or the footnotes there are some twenty emendations published since 1864 by Cobet and others or provided for this edition by Gow, Post, and Warmington. Of these, i. 19 ὑποδνόμενον (Post), ii. 22 ἀραία στημόνια τῶν ἱματίων (Gow), v. 11 ἀποκριθείσης (Gow), and v. 42 ἀφορεῖν (Post) are noteworthy. The neatest are i. 3 ζωῶ for ζῳῶ (Cobet) and iv. 49 λιχνεύσασα for ἀνιχνεύσασα (Rademacher).

Hercher tended to be overzealous, as he himself recognized, and the editor is undoubtedly justified in adopting the manuscript readings which he has restored. The process might well have been extended. For example, i. 51 εἰ

case one might suppose that the speaker began, 'For not yet are all days . . .'; then, instead of adding the obvious continuation 'at an end', interrupted herself with the oath that ends at the end of l. 52; and then, instead of finishing the interrupted sentence, began again with οὐκ ᾔδῃ. I rather prefer this way of taking it.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

## THE LOEB PLUTARCH

HAROLD CHERNISS and WILLIAM C. HELMBOLD: Plutarch, *Moralia*. Vol. xii. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xii+590. London: Heinemann, 1957. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS extremely useful volume contains *De facie in orbe lunae* edited by Professor Cherniss, and a group of works edited by Professor Helmbold, of which *De sollertia animalium* is the most important. The volume goes to 999b, i.e. the end of *De esu carniū* ii. Professor Cherniss's notes and references make his part of the book a valuable contribution to the understanding of one of Plutarch's most difficult works, and one which has not always been fortunate in its editors. Some of his suggestions were already published (in *Classical Philology*, xli [1951]), but there is much here that is new. With Pohlenz's new text, which was not available to Cherniss, discussion about *De facie* should now be greatly stimulated. The weakness of Cherniss's work lies in the translation, which is often needlessly clumsy, and—to the reviewer at least—far less felicitous and readable than Prickard's. Helmbold's work, conceived less ambitiously, includes fairly adequate annotation, and he has had useful help from Professor A. C. Andrews on zoological points. His text is less 'conservative' than the new Teubner, and he is surely right in this; but it is a pity that he was not able to use the materials assembled by Hubert both for the establishment of the text and for illustration.

Perhaps I may offer a few criticisms of detail.

p. 29. The bibliography on *De facie* should include the old Bohn translation by C. W. King, which contains some original ideas, and, if not as good as Prickard, is superior to Raingeard, with whom Cherniss deals with just severity. There are also some remarks on *De facie* in S. Sambursky, *The Physical World of the Greeks* (1956), chap. ix. p. 56, n. 3. May not ταῖς ἐκλείψεσιν be instrumental dative with ἀλίσκομένη? This would be more normal; but cf. not only the passage from Theo but datives with festivals, τοῖς Διονυσίοις and the like. p. 80, 16. παθέων is indeed a possible κοινή form (Blass-Debrunner, *N.T. Gramm.* §48) but Plutarch apparently always has παθῶν elsewhere and so should be given it here. p. 94 (928d-e). Cherniss translates as though δόγματος depended on τὰς ἀποδείξεις, but presumably does not construe the sentence like this. However, to say that the δόγμα βαδίζει ἐπὶ τὰς ἀποδείξεις does not seem very natural. The λόγος may do so (as with Pohlenz's βαδίζοντα) or Lucius may himself, and I suggest that this is most likely and we should read βαδίζοντι. p. 132, 5. The supplement <λέγει> surely gives the wrong sense: <λήγει> or <σιωπᾶν>? p. 196, beginning of c. 28. Lamprias' question, as Pohlenz says, is a real one, not a rhetorical one. p. 214, 4. ὁρθῶς must go with λελέχθαι, not with ἡγοῦ. p. 292, 17. φασί probably draws attention to the quasi-proverbial phrase

ἐχθὲς καὶ πρῶτην and does not refer, as Helmbold's note implies, to some persons who are authorities for a version of the legend of Prometheus. p. 318, 2. Wyttenbach's transposition of ποιητήν and ἀγαθόν is necessary. p. 346, 13. An alternative remedy, perhaps easier, is to keep ἐρέαν but add <ᾶν> after παντρά-πασιν. p. 400. Both Helmbold and Hubert in the new Teubner edition seem to have missed the charming description of nightingales teaching one another to sing in Pliny, *N.H.* x. 83. p. 450, 15. Βουνῶν is presumably from Βουνοί 'hills', which seems a likely enough local name: Helmbold's acceptance of C. O. Müller's Βουλίδος is odd. p. 504, 9. No need to suspect οἷς δῆ. p. 504, 17. Ἀκούεις is idiomatic: see, for example, *Gorgias* 503c and other examples in Kühner-Gerth i. 135 ff. p. 515, on 989c: reference to *Od.* xix. 225 has been accidentally omitted. p. 520, 10. ὑμῶν 'you men', not 'your men'.

This volume contains an exceptional amount of useful material and ideas. As the Loeb *Moralia* progresses, it becomes more ambitious; and in Cherniss's work on *De facie* it reaches a very high level indeed.

St. John's College, Oxford

D. A. RUSSELL

## THE LOEB AELIAN

A. F. SCHOLFIELD: *Aelian, On Animals*. With an English translation. Vol. i (Books i-iv). (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xxix+359. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.

THIS volume shows knowledge and precision, and promises well for those that are to come. Aelian is not the most presentable of Greek authors, and Mr. Scholfield is to be congratulated on the skilful handling of his introduction, the phrasing and tone of which are impeccable throughout. An excellent characterization of Aelian as an author is followed by a masterly summary of the evidence relating to his sources; and finally there is a brief reference to Aelian's influence in later times as exemplified in the medieval bestiary. Here a slightly fuller account would have been welcome. Incidentally, it would have been of some interest to know the extent to which Aelian is considered responsible for contributing to our common stock of ideas such clichés as 'the King of Beasts', 'raven locks', 'a white elephant'. The editor may feel that such a problem of transmission calls for a special study; and he is no doubt right.

The text, we are told, 'is substantially that of Hercher's edition of 1864'. This was a revision of the Didot text of 1858, in connexion with which Hercher had elaborated criteria for detecting the glosses and interpolations which he proceeded to exclude. The editor pays a tribute to Hercher's work. He is, however, rather less dependent on him than his unassuming statement might imply. There are about six passages in the present volume where the manuscript reading is preferred to Hercher's, and in the text or the footnotes there are some twenty emendations published since 1864 by Cobet and others or provided for this edition by Gow, Post, and Warmington. Of these, i. 19 ὑποδύμενον (Post), ii. 22 ἄραια στημόνια τῶν ἱματίων (Gow), v. 11 ἀποκριθείσης (Gow), and v. 42 ἀφορεῖν (Post) are noteworthy. The neatest are i. 3 ζῶω for ζῶω (Cobet) and iv. 49 λιχνεύσασα for ἀνιχνεύσασα (Radermacher).

Hercher tended to be overzealous, as he himself recognized, and the editor is undoubtedly justified in adopting the manuscript readings which he has restored. The process might well have been extended. For example, i. 51 εἰ

ταῦτα οὕτως (ταῦτ' ἀψευδῶς Hercher) πεπίστευται causes no difficulty if we translate οὕτως 'without further ado': L. & S. quote several examples from Plato with ἀκούειν and ἀκοῦσαι. Again, in i. 59, a minor point, ὑπὲρ τούτων can surely be retained: cf. ii. 31. A more important case occurs in ii. 11 (p. 102) οὕτως ἄρα ἡ φύσις μεγέθει μὲν αὐτὸν (the elephant) μέγιστον εἰργάσατο, μάθησις (Jacobs, Hercher) δὲ πραότατον ἀπέφηνε καὶ εὐάγωνον, where the manuscript reading μαθήσει has everything in its favour; first, because μάθησις ruins the structure of the sentence, and secondly because we are not here concerned with the Socratic antithesis of nature and learning, but with something more naïve and also more rhetorical. The elephant has not only size, but also patience in learning (τῆς ἐς τὰ μαθήματα εὐκολίας above), both of which are Nature's gifts. iv. 23 ὥδικώτερος δὲ ἑαυτοῦ μᾶλλον is hardly objectionable, nor is it likely to have been produced by a scribe. iv. 36 Scholfield adopts Hercher's καὶ μάλα οἰκτίστα for καὶ οἰκτίστα μὲν ἀλλὰ ὤκιστα. The disappearance of ὤκιστα, however, deprives us of an essential point, the contrast with χρόνῳ δὲ ἀπόλλυται. There are good precedents for μὲν ἀλλά, and δέ may well have been avoided for the sake of euphony.

In i. 58, where Gow's ἐτοίμοι is attractive, γελοῖοι is retained, but obelized. The construction εἰσιν αἰρεθῆναι γελοῖοι might be defended by an appeal to Hor. Sat. ii. 8. 24, *ridiculus totas semel absorbere placentas*, a memorable line of which there may conceivably be a subconscious reminiscence. One minor emendation might be considered. v. 3 ἐς ἀνθρακίαν στορέσαι would read more naturally without ἐς: cf. *Iliad* ix. 213. Scholfield's translation is in fact 'to scatter the embers'. There are difficulties in i. 8 which I hope to discuss elsewhere.

The translation is scholarly and agreeable. A few difficulties of interpretation may be noted. At the end of the Prologue, order and phrasing throw special emphasis on πολλοῖς: 'Although a host of early savants has preceded me . . .' rather than 'Although I was born later than many accomplished writers of an earlier day. . .'. i. 30 (end) the feminine participle shows that it is not the basse but the prawn who is slain in novel fashion, suffocated by the blood which she herself has shed. i. 57. Was the test with the snakes a general practice or a unique occurrence? Hercher (Didot) and Scholfield take the former view in their versions. Most of the tenses admit of either interpretation (the present infinitives can represent present or past continuous action; the aorist indicatives can be aoristic, as so often in Aelian, or past). However, the imperfect indicatives ἐπανίσταντο, ἡγρίανον, ἡπείλουν point to a single occasion, as does the introductory remark, 'there is a story current among the Libyans'. In this case, ἐμβάλλει will be an historic present. ii. 5 ἀναγκαίους φαρμάκους suggests 'drastic' rather than 'necessary medicines'. ii. 11 (p. 103) hardly 'I shall state the most important events first', but 'the earliest events': τὰ γε πρεσβύτατα could bear either meaning, but first the training of the elephants is described, and then their astonishing performances, which are the climax of the story. Aelian is observing the chronological sequence of events (τιμῶν τὸν χρόνον). iv. 7 ἀποδείκνυνται is surely deponent. iv. 17 the stone is probably not amber, which would be unsuitable for engraving, but perhaps tourmaline or zircon; and for the same reason the γαγάτης of v. 47 is certainly not lignite, and perhaps not even jet, but possibly black quartz. iv. 36 οὐκέτι πορφυρᾶν means 'not purple like the rest': see Cope's edition of Arist. *Rhet.*, vol. i, p. 14.

The identification of Aelian's animals has been carried out with good judge-

ment. In matters of dispute concerning birds and fishes, D'Arcy Thompson seems generally to have been preferred to other authorities, and rightly so.

Apart from the final lines of p. 338, which have escaped revision, I have noticed only two misprints, on p. 234 ( $\tilde{a}$  for  $\delta$ ), and on p. 319 (Agatharcides).

A serious inconvenience is the lack of an index. Let us hope that rising costs do not make this an established practice in the future production of Loeb editions. An index to the final volume is not enough: Aelian is an author for whom such an aid is indispensable at every stage. If this is intended as an experiment, the body on which it has been performed could not have been more unhappily chosen.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

## TIMAEUS OF TAUROMENIUM

TRUESDELL S. BROWN: *Timaeus of Tauromenium*. (University of California Publications in History, vol. 55.) Pp. ix+165. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1958. Paper, \$3.50.

PROFESSOR BROWN, who has already produced excellent work on Hellenistic historians, now publishes a welcome monograph on Timaeus, probably the most famous and most abused of them. There are five chapters: 'Timaeus' Life and Writings'; 'Geography, Myth, and Prehistory'; 'The Good Old Days' (from the foundation of the Greek colonies in the west to the last decade of the fifth century); 'Modern Times' (from the Carthaginian invasion of Sicily in 409-408 to the death of Agathocles); 'Timaeus and his Critics'. In choosing how his material should be arranged Brown has been confronted with a difficult problem by the tirade against Timaeus in Polybius xii; for he has both to use it as evidence for the content of Timaeus' *History* and to assess its general validity. His decision to deal with the latter separately in his concluding chapter avoids confusion and is probably wise, though it necessitates a multitude of cross-references.

He is also perhaps wise in not 'attempting to discuss the fragments in terms of their original order in the *History*' (p. 23) and in preferring to arrange them 'chronologically in accordance with the persons or events to which they allude' (p. 43). The uncertainties involved in trying to reconstruct the *History* book by book, especially from the accession of the elder Dionysius onwards, have recently been demonstrated by F. Jacoby in his commentary (*F. Gr. Hist.* iii b Kommentar [Text], pp. 538-46), which Brown was unfortunately not able to use. It is, however, surely a mistake to maintain, as Brown does (pp. 43 and 71), that Timaeus did not write a continuous narrative in chronological order, though his voluminous work must have been loosely constructed, perhaps in the Herodotean manner.

It is a merit rather than a demerit of this book that it does not answer very positively the fundamental question 'What kind of work was the *History* of Timaeus?' Apart from the possibility of discoveries in papyri, a satisfactory answer could be given only if a substantial amount of some extant work were shown to have been derived largely from Timaeus. The claim of R. Laqueur (*R.E.* vi a [1936], coll. 1082-1187) to have recovered considerable parts of the *History* by minute dissection of Diodorus' Sicilian narrative is unconvincing, and Brown rightly rejects it with gentle and gentlemanly firmness (p. 21). He



does not refer to the more judicious attempt by K. F. Stroheker (*Satura O. Weinreich dargebracht* [1952], pp. 139-61) to show from the narrative of Diodorus on the elder Dionysius how Timaeus modified the account of Philistus, which was favourable to the tyrant, to suit his own unfavourable picture. It is, however, arguable that Diodorus is here less dependent on Timaeus than Stroheker believes. Jacoby (op. cit., p. 529) is justifiably cautious on this point. The *History* of Timaeus provided Plutarch, directly or indirectly, with information on Sicilian history, as is seen most clearly in the *Timoleon*, but such is the quality of the *Lives* that the characteristics of the writers on whose works they depend are seldom easily traceable. Brown with good reason concludes that 'the only safe procedure is to adhere closely to the known fragments' (p. 21).

The fragments of Timaeus, though more numerous than those of some other well-known historians, provide a woefully incomplete picture of his *History*. Two less estimable characteristics which won him the nicknames *Ἐπιτίμαος* and *Γρασοσυλλέκτης* are more than adequately represented in the fragments: of the qualities responsible for his high reputation in antiquity scarcely any indication is supplied. In some instances his views on great men and great events are unknown. For example, his verdict on Dion, which Brown unjustifiably presumes to have been favourable (pp. 19 and 83), is not determinable (*Historia*, ii [1954], 295 n. 3). As Brown states, it is melancholy that, whereas Timaeus' account of the Athenian expedition to Sicily is almost wholly lost, one of the few fragments is concerned with the courtesan *Lais*, who was among the captives from Hyccara (p. 67): another gives a fanciful derivation of the name Hyccara (F 23). Here, however, Brown misses the opportunity to draw a general conclusion of importance; for the fragments suggest that local patriotism led Timaeus to underrate the value of Peloponnesian aid to Syracuse (Brown does refer briefly to this on p. 44) and to represent Hermocrates and the Syracusans as responsible for the Athenian disaster. On the other hand, Brown makes excellent use of the fragments on the younger Dionysius, concluding that Timaeus pictured him as 'weak rather than vicious' (p. 81). Because the fragments belonging to the earlier books of the *History* are somewhat more informative and because a long passage of Diodorus v, which is undoubtedly based on Timaeus, may be added to these, Timaeus the ethnographer and prehistorian is a clearer figure than Timaeus the historian of his own times and of the two preceding centuries; Brown shows convincingly that he had 'a theory of progressive deterioration' (pp. 41-42, cf. p. 59). Another valid generalization is that it was one of Timaeus' aims to focus attention on 'the important yet neglected contribution made by the Greeks in Sicily and the west' (p. 44).

'Within the limits necessarily imposed by the state of our information' (p. vi) Brown has made another valuable contribution to the study of Hellenistic historians. The book is pleasantly written and contains some agreeable *obiter dicta* in the American manner. 'Timaeus actually foams at the mouth' (p. 5) is perhaps a little too colourful. There are a few minor errors and misprints. For example, on p. 16 Brown remarks that 'Philistus and Philiscus could easily become confused with one another': at the bottom of p. 5 they have. On pp. 69-70 all the references to Diodorus should be to xiii, not xii, and on p. 71 it is erroneously implied that Diodorus xviii includes chapters on Sicilian history.

## PHILOSOPHY OF HISTORY

ERIC VOEGELIN: *Order and History*. Vol. ii: *The World of the Polis*. Vol. iii: *Plato and Aristotle*. Pp. xviii+389; xvii+383. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 48s. net each volume.

THESE two volumes are part of a large undertaking to be completed in six altogether. Already claims have been made that the work is comparable with those of Spengler and Toynbee. Vol. i was entitled *Israel and Revelation* and vol. iv, which is entitled *Empire and Christianity*, is to begin with Alexander the Great, so that more than half will be concerned with the ancient world, and the general conception of the work is of great interest. Throughout the Middle Ages and right down to the eighteenth century the general view of history had been that of St. Augustine, developed into the theory of *historia sacra*. One unsatisfactory feature of this was that the whole history of Greece and Rome figured merely as a *praeparatio evangelica*. In the nineteenth century this view tended to be replaced by two quite separate and contrasted attitudes. There was first of all a sort of secularized *historia sacra*, as in Hegel for whom history was the story of the unfolding of the Idea, and in less metaphysical form in the view that history is the story of the development of human reason down the ages whether in a single stream or in a number of parallel streams in different parts of the world. On the other hand, *historia sacra* tended to be replaced by a supposedly scientific approach, typified by the phenomenalism of the first six volumes of Toynbee's *Study of History*, according to which all civilizations and their manifestations are of equal interest to the historian. This for Voegelin constitutes the annihilation of history. He would insist, on the one hand, upon the importance of the transcendent divine Being as constituting the direction of human striving, while on the other hand rejecting the Gnostic mistake committed by Hegel and the historians of human reason according to whom it is possible to know and so to state the essence of the divine Nature. The study of history is rather the study of successive attempts by communities to achieve the transcendent divine order for themselves and the symbolic forms of those attempts.

In this meaningful history the Greeks have a most important part to play because they originated philosophy as a symbol of Western society. Greek history is seen as a progression from myth to transcendent divine order expressed in an actualized political order—that of the Polis—and symbolized in Philosophy. In this way Voegelin combines in a single story the intellectual development of the Greeks and their political history. This is discussed in three stages—from the Minoans to Thucydides, Plato, Aristotle. The discussion of the first stage suffers very much from the idiosyncrasies of the approach. Like Jaeger in *Paideia*, Voegelin is viewing the course of Greek thought from a particular point of view. But the concept of order is so general that almost everything can be classified as a struggle for order and yet when we have done so we have often said very little indeed. Thus we read (vol. i, p. 60):

'In the history of Cretan society, though we know so regrettably little about the detail, the rudiments of a form of order can be discerned that will later become the great problem of Hellenic Society. The town culture, as

we have stressed, is the matrix of civilizational societies which effectively participate in the quest of mankind for true order. If we now recognize, as an advance toward effective participation, the creation of a society in which common humanity beyond membership in a biologically determined group is accepted, as it is clearly done in town cultures, we have touched the level of experience which can motivate more than one type of larger societies with their orders and symbols.'

There is a real danger here and elsewhere of concealing the trivial beneath portentous language. Moreover, the development from myth to philosophy is regarded always as part of the historical consciousness of Hellenic Society, and so the philosophic writers as well as the poets are brought into the discussion of the Greek struggle for order. But even for the Athenians there is much to suggest that before Isocrates they had little historical consciousness, and that the Pre-Socratics at any rate were very much on the side-lines before the sophistic movement at Athens. The interesting chapters discussing particular writers are perhaps better evidence for the views of those individual writers than for any 'Hellenic historical consciousness'.

The greater part of vol. iii is devoted to Plato and in particular to the *Republic*, much of which is interpreted rather symbolically. Thus Socrates' *κατάβασις* to the Piraeus prefigures the descent of the soul to the cave and also to the underworld. We even read 'the festival of the Piraeus in honor of Bendis is characterised by the equality of the participants. Socrates can find no difference in the quality of the processions; a common level of humanity has been reached by the society of which Socrates is a member.' But there is a sense in which Plato's political theory can be said to contain the essence of Hellenic society and there is much that is both fresh and sound in the present discussion. Noteworthy is the suggestion that the *Laws* do not represent any abandonment of the views in the *Republic*, but stand to it as the institutional Church does to the Sermon on the Mount. The discussion of Aristotle in relation to Plato and the problem of the development of Aristotle's own thought is good. Voegelin does not suppose that Aristotle ever came to abandon metaphysics. But he does suppose that his political thought is vitiated by a fundamental confusion, typified in the need to distinguish between the good man and the good citizen, and this in turn is regarded as a sign of the necessary failure of any immanentist metaphysics.

University College, Swansea

G. B. KERFERD

## THE POETICS

GERALD F. ELSE: *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Pp. xiv+670. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1957. Cloth, 84s.

Aristotle *On Poetry and Style*. Translated with an Introduction by G. M. A. GRUBE. (Library of Liberal Arts, No. 68.) Pp. xxxii+110. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1958. Paper, 80 cents.

It may be true that some of what agreement there is about the interpretation of the *Poetics* rests on the tacit acceptance of a *fable convenue*. Professor Else

makes it his aim to look with fresh eyes at old problems which have been smothered in layers of commentary and by returning to the words of Aristotle, and interpreting them with close attention to the argument of the *Poetics* as a whole, to force his way into Aristotle's meaning. The attempt is conducted with skill and pertinacity; a surprising number of novel conclusions are reached and, if few of them convince, there are a great many which cannot be rejected out of hand. The *Poetics* is made to appear as a more coherent and more closely argued body of doctrine than has often been supposed. Whether or not Else's conclusions are accepted (and on most of the major problems his conclusions do not seem acceptable to me), this is a book which students of the *Poetics* will have to reckon with. For Else brings to his task as well as learning an acute mind.

The book takes the form of text and translation printed in short sections followed by pages of comment in which the text adopted is justified and the argument expounded. In this way the whole of the *Poetics* is discussed except chapters 12, 16, the middle of 19 to the end of 22, and 25, which are regarded as, for one reason or another, separable from the rest of the work. Exposition turns largely on the isolation of later additions to the text. Else denotes by brackets of different types supplements made by Aristotle himself and additions introduced mainly in the Byzantine period. The fourteen supplements attributed to Aristotle are not essentially different from parentheses; it is not suggested that they need have been added much later, only 'after the first draft had hardened' or 'next morning' or 'on the heels of the text itself'. They are interruptions which tend to conceal the sequence of thought. But anyone writing, for whatever reason, in a style so receptive of interpolations may well include them in his first draft, because it is more economical of time and space to add in parenthesis facts and ideas which are extraneous to the argument than to embody them in a logical structure. More important are the 70 or so additions which are supposed to be of much later date; these are mostly single words or phrases, but include the whole of chapter 12. That some glosses have crept into the text would be agreed by most editors. Indeed many of Else's excisions had been proposed previously. He finds support for his assumption of a large number of such glosses in the Arabic version of 49<sup>b</sup>6 *ut relinquatur omnis sermo, qui est per compendium* (Tkatsch) which represents a warning in the Syriac original that the translator is to ignore these glosses, in this case the names Epicharmus and Phormus or Phormis, which in fact are missing from the Arabic version. If we accept the suggestion that the list of plays whose plots could be derived from the *Little Iliad* (59<sup>b</sup>5) is taken direct from Proclus, the evidence for late additions becomes stronger still. Superficially the approach has much in common with de Montmollin's, but their conclusions rarely harmonize, and Else would claim with some justification that his results are based on a more penetrating analysis of Aristotle's argument and less on purely grammatical indications. Nor does he deny the use by Aristotle of parentheses.

To select a few of the more startling suggestions: Else believes the *Poetics* to be an early work composed when Plato's influence was still strong, and he sees the scheme of the forms of *mimesis* as essentially diaeretic, though based on the triple division into rhythm, harmony, and words. But since neither words nor music could exist for a Greek without rhythm, the division is really bipartite, and what Aristotle is doing is to distinguish music from poetry. But the notion that a Greek could not conceive even prose as without rhythm seems to be contradicted by *Gorgias* 502 c.

The account of the origins of art in chapter iv is improved in its proportions by the excision of 48<sup>b</sup>7-9 and 13-19 as supplements, and it is well argued that 'the two causes' are pleasure in imitation and in rhythm, because both are referred to in *πεφυκότες πρὸς αὐτὰ* <sup>b</sup>22 (accepting the reading of B) and *ἐγέννησαν* in the next line picks up the *γεννησαι* of the opening. More questionable is the conclusion that *οὗτος ἐκείνο* [*sic*] at <sup>b</sup>18 must, in Aristotle, refer to the recognition that an individual belongs to a certain genus and that the *εἰκόνες* are drawings and sections of animals and cadavers from Aristotle's biology lab. The history in this chapter is treated as an *a priori* logical structure; 'there are no facts in the narrative before the time of Aeschylus at least'. Indeed the *ἐξάρχοντες* are relegated to a supplement and, most drastic of all, *τρεῖς δὲ καὶ σκηνογραφίαν Σοφοκλῆς . . . ἀπεσεμνύνθη* 49<sup>a</sup>18-21 condemned as late. Aeschylus' allowance of the supremacy of dialogue over lyric marks the vital achievement of tragedy, and, as the poet was himself still an actor, the introduction of a second actor makes up the complete three, an interpretation already given by Else in *T.A.P.A.* lxx (1939).

The *μήκος* of tragedy 49<sup>b</sup>12 is taken to be time of performance rather than of action, and *ἐξαλλάττειν* rendered 'vary from' not 'exceed'. It may be true that 'empty time' was not reckoned so that the two times would be in some relation to each other, but Else has no intelligible explanation to give of the time when tragedy too was *ἀόριστος τῷ χρόνῳ*.

Much that is true is said about 'more philosophic than history', but I am not convinced that there is 'no principle outside of character itself that can determine what can happen to a man' and that accordingly the poet's sense of the nature of *τὸ εἶκος ἢ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον* contributes nothing.

*Anagnorisis* and *peripeiteia* are rightly brought into connexion with *hamartia* and based on *παρὰ τὴν δόξαν δι' ἄλλα* at 52<sup>a</sup>4. But Else asserts that it is the *δόξα* of the audience not of the character which is disappointed. To do this he reads *〈δ〉 ἐλθὼν, ὡς εὐφρανῶν* 52<sup>a</sup>25, and translates 'the messenger who has arrived, when it seems that he will make O. happy . . . does the opposite', an unnatural rendering of *ὡς* with the fut. part. As for *hamartia* it is no *flaw* but the *ἄγνοια* of the change *ἐξ ἀγνοίας εἰς γνῶσιν*. This is true. 'A reason for the superiority of *hamartia* as the cause of the tragic action is that it supplies a plausible reason for the fall of a good (though not perfect) man.' But so interpreted it is limited to complex plays, and it is perilous to argue that none but plays with a full *anagnorisis* are completely tragic, when only two of Sophocles' extant plays qualify.

On the question of character Else is no more successful than other interpreters in showing why, when most of the world's great tragedies depict the misfortunes of good men, Aristotle should have rejected this type of plot. His tacit assumption that *ἐπιεικής* means 'perfect' and *χρηστός* merely 'good' is unsupported by Greek usage. The unity of chapter xv on character is helped by accepting *ἥθους* for *μύθου* at 54<sup>b</sup>1, but the suggestion that it is 'a serious flaw' in Medea's characterization that she failed, being a notoriously clever woman, to remember to provide for her own escape is too literal-minded and fails to take account of the nature of Euripides' Epilogues. But the emendation *〈ἐν〉 Αὐλῶδι* in the next line is highly ingenious and gives the sense that his interpretation requires.

It can hardly be held against Else that he fails to introduce order into the chaos of the classification of the parts and types of tragedy. The suggestion of



ἐπεισοδιώδης for the missing category at 56<sup>a2</sup> is unconvincing. It is less obvious than he supposes that if a tragedy is set in Hades the connexion between the scenes must be loose. Still less satisfactory is the identification of ἠθική with the 'moral'. This cannot fairly be deduced from the fact that in the *Odyssey*, which is called ἠθική, Odysseus wins the success he deserves. This is an example of a slightly scholastic tendency to press words harder than the context warrants which is to be found elsewhere in this book, for instance at 52<sup>b37</sup> where it is argued that οὕτε . . . φιλόφρων implies that the previous case, the passage of ὁ ἐπεικὴς εἰς δυστυχίαν, must itself be φιλόφρων.

Most drastic of all is the handling of κάθαρσις. That famous clause is bracketed as an afterthought; τῶν παθημάτων are not emotions but the scenes of πάθος as defined at 52<sup>b11</sup>; what is purged is the element of μαρόν present in the deeds of horror which supply the subject-matter of tragedy, and the reason why it is purged is that they are committed in ignorance under the influence of *hamartia*. Thus the explanation is to be found not in the *Politics* but within the *Poetics* in ch. xiv. It is fair to add that Else is aware of the difficulties of this solution and expresses them with admirable candour.

All in all the book is more likely to provoke thought than to change minds. The difficulties raised are usually real, but the argument is too fine spun, the handling of the text too free, for the method to carry conviction unless the superiority of the new conclusions were overwhelming.

It was a good idea to include under one cover a translation of the *Poetics* and of the first twelve chapters of Book iii of the *Rhetoric*. Professor Grube gives a serviceable rendering together with introduction, footnotes, and biographical index suitable for the Greekless reader.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

## THE FASTI

P. Ovidius Naso: *Die Fasten*. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert von FRANZ BÖMER. i: Einleitung, Text und Übersetzung. ii: Kommentar. Pp. 301, 427. Heidelberg: Winter, 1957, 1958. Paper, DM. 25.44.

SOME features of Bömer's first volume are disappointing. The introduction is sober and informative; the translation, grounded on extremely sensible principles (pp. 7 f.), is on the whole dependable, though I have noticed a few errors in passing. The text is constructed on sound principles also (p. 51), but in practice the editor's judgement is uneven: i. 201 *totus vix stabat* (accepted from U) at the instance of Marx (for his pernicious influence cf. also iii. 137, iv. 613; and the Commentary at ii. 107, v. 689, vi. 387, 619; it is, incidentally, not true that, apart from *Nux* [not by Ovid, anyway] 45, causal sentences with *quia* only occur in the *Fasti* (p. 49): see *A.A.* ii. 147); 636 *versurum*, translated 'sich . . . ereignen', but no parallels adduced for the sense; iii. 363 *atque* unelided printed without remark and without reference to the fact that *A* reads *aque* (not *aquae*, as in Lenz's note); 634 *fremens* is most unlikely: see Palmer on *Her.* 13. 110 (at iii. 766 *amans* is a slightly different case, but read *amat* nevertheless; in the same verse *erat* in text, *est* translated: cf. ii. 282); iv. 301 *operis* (from *A*); 477 print *tempe*, not *Tempe* (478 *zephyri*!); 683 *Carseolis* needs justification in



face of Heinsius's *Carseoli*; 755 *degrandinat*: no mention of D's -et; v. 210 *rigantur*: Ovidian usage demands -atur; 274 *virent*, but the parallels are for *uiridis*, which is not quite the same thing (cf. *infra*); 335 *tota* (not translated, incidentally): for the obvious correction *pota* cf. A.A. iii. 753; vi. 268 *significantque deam terra focusque suam*: Bömer's correction gives the wrong sense, for how can the earth at once be the goddess (267) and symbolize her?; 355 *malorum* is not supported by Tr. iv. 1. 61, where *malorum* is governed by *leuior* (cf. Sil. ii. 102 *opum leuior*, the earliest example known to Kühner-Stegmann (i. 444); perhaps = *leuior*, for which cf. Plaut. *Rud.* 247 *ut me omnium iam laborum leuas!* Madvig (*Lat. Gramm.* 261, n. 4) was wrong to class this genitive as a Grecism: cf. Sonnenschein on Plaut. *Rud.* 349; 760 *moverat*: the parallels for *artem mouere* are hardly to the point (for the *mou-/nou-* confusion cf. ii. 490). In a text published in 1957 one does not expect to find such spellings as *Hyphisylea* (iii. 82), *Ariadneo* (v. 346), *Progne* (ii. 629, 855: Bömer's note at *Gymn.* lxiv [1957], 126 f. attempts to put the clock back thirty years. Cf. *Gnosida* at iii. 460), *Gyge* (iv. 593: when will this spectre be laid? Incidentally, Scaliger corrected (rightly) to *Gye*, not *Gya*). There are more or less serious misprints in the text at ii. 854 (*et* for *nec*), iii. 638, 646, iv. 452, v. 149, vi. 100 (as the critical note shows).

In spite of these blemishes the text is tolerably good. The same cannot be said for the apparatus criticus. This is based on the work of Landi, Lenz, Peeters, and Castiglioni (why not have included Frazer? He compiled his apparatus with photographs<sup>1</sup> of AUDGM before him and is usually trustworthy). 'Amateurish' would scarcely be too harsh a word for the result: I find errors of fact, omissions, and the obscurities usual in the work of those who add critical notes to their texts because it is customary rather than with any idea of enlightening the reader. The negative principle is in any case unsuitable for a tradition of this kind, and can often be highly misleading: it is unsafe, for instance, to draw conclusions about the reading of M from Bömer's silence. A few examples of various defects: i. 64 *primus* is in UM; 146 M<sup>1</sup> has *fassus*; 443 source of *quae*?; 645 the reading of A<sup>1</sup> was not, as one might deduce *ex silentio*, *sparsos* (it looks like *passos* in the photograph, but I cannot be sure); ii. 282 Bentley's and Madvig's *obit* is implied by the translation, but not mentioned in the note; 567 a note on *supersint* is perhaps not absolutely necessary, but many more trivial points are noticed, and evidence of such scribal tendencies (indic. for subj.) is always worth preserving; 568 the lemma should lead (this error recurs); iii. 115 source of *feni*?; 229 G<sup>1</sup> is misreported: it has *inde die quae prima meas*; v. 274 'virent GM' is too confident: certainly M<sup>1</sup> seems to have had *vident*; vi. 31-32 no note on the omission of these verses by G; 567 G has *caesus*; vi. 757 a good example of a note designed to puzzle the inquirer. Abbreviation which is no doubt natural enough in German (IKG = the law of the *brevis breuians*, iii. 852 n.) is not equally admissible in Latin: *p.* (= *post*), *m.* (both *marg.* and *man.*: e.g. '*i.m. m. rec.*'), *cl.* (i. 547: *collato*?), *s.l.p.* (ii. 361: ??) do not save enough time and ink to be worth the annoyance they cause. German conventions of punctuation have affected the text: there are frequently commas where the older editors correctly preferred heavier stops (e.g. i. 17, iii. 314, v. 233, vi. 90, *al.*).

It is Bömer's second volume which will be of lasting use. 'Im Kommentar . . . , ausgehend von der Tatsache, daß . . . die Fasti in den meisten Fällen nicht um ihrer selbst willen nachgeschlagen oder gar gelesen werden [I was disposed

<sup>1</sup> Which the Librarian of Trinity College has kindly allowed me to see.

to challenge this, but after my first complete reading in five years found myself in reluctant agreement], . . . sollen Tatsachen gegeben werden.' 'Commentary', in fact, is almost a misnomer: this is a reference book to which Ovid's text serves as a convenient index. As such it is, like the Introduction, written in *R.E.* prose, a repellent but economical idiom (cf. Henry, 'the safe and easy brevity of the professorial cortina'!) in which parentheses, often of inordinate length, do duty for footnotes. It is not for the tyro: the discussions are allusive, polemical, and thickly (too thickly?) sown with references, and suppose readers already acquainted with the special problems of Roman religion. It cannot be recommended, like Frazer, as a bedside book: there are few digressions, no leisurely topographical excursions and reminiscences; and *no maps and plans*. But to what Frazer described as 'the Sisyphean task of extracting modern sense from ancient nonsense'—and the interpretation of the *Fasti* often amounts to this—Bömer brings essential gifts: to a vast erudition he adds modesty ('Der II. Band hat nichts unstützend Neues entdeckt', i. 7), caution, and a sober judgement; time and again his innate scepticism restrains him from theorizing beyond the evidence. The consequence sometimes is that his readers, expecting a solution, may simply have the evidence dumped in their laps; but this approach, in view especially of the nature and past history of the subject (Frazer!), has much to be said for it. As with all reference books, the sum of merits and failings will only be revealed by time and use. Meanwhile the overworked but in this case inevitable adjective 'indispensable' will have to serve.

On one aspect of the commentary, however, more may be said immediately. 'Sprachliche und dichterische Interessen hat [Frazer] nicht.' Bömer's attempt to fill this gap is praiseworthy, but the results are too often mechanical and perfunctory. Many of his notes on Ovid's usage are compilations from the *Thesaurus* which the interested reader could worry out for himself; while really fascinating topics such as Ovid's apparently wilful trick of variation (e.g. of number i. 256, iv. 863; tense ii. 523-4; vocabulary v. 176-7; etc.) or use of ἀπό κοινοῦ order (e.g. i. 112, 186) pass unremarked. The notes on metre are sometimes naïve, sometimes wrong; and too much (I repeat) is heard of the *lex Marxii*. The following examples may support these strictures and suggest improvements: i. 49 *toto . . . die*: instead of the hopeless endeavour to prove that these words *could* be dative, a note on that interesting syntactical phenomenon, the ablative of the duration of time, would be more to the point; 396 'Der Vers ist bei FRAZER nicht übersetzt': this is untrue, but I mention it because Bömer is prone to censure Frazer's interpretations when he has not really understood them (see, for example, ii. 56, iii. 322, vi. 424, 644 nn.; another minor annoyance is his habit of crediting him with spellings like 'Iuppiter'); ii. 115 *pretiumque vehendi / cantat: pretium u.* is in apposition to *cantat*, not its object (the position of *-que*, answered by *et*, obscures the construction); 327 'Die Wendung *cibo u. dgl. fungi . . .* gibt es im Lateinischen nur in den Fasten': literally true but essentially false, cf. *A.A.* ii. 227 *epulis perfuncta* (if such a note is worth writing at all it is worth getting quite right); iii. 225 a bare reference to *Met.* iii. 347 is a very poor substitute for a note on Ovid's use of syllepsis; 507 *audibat iam dudum*: how can this usage be 'aoristisch'?; 671 *atque ita* 'und dann': no, but 'in this attire' (cf. *Am.* iii. 6. 80 = 'in this attitude'); iv. 181 it is by no means mere pedantry to insist that the *tibia* was not a flute in any modern sense of the word; 778 to take exception to Frazer's rendering and interpretation of *vivo . . . rore* = 'in living dew' on the ground that it is 'nur schlecht vorstellbar'

is, especially in the light of Frazer's note, apriorism run mad;<sup>1</sup> v. 140, 142: the rhythm deserves comment; 311 *correcta oblivia damnis*, three words, for which Bömer needs thirteen (this is not a reproach): a good example of Ovidian telegraphese (another is 290 just above), well worth comment—*here* is the opportunity of the *Sprachgebrauch* enthusiast; 562 this note on the ablative without *a* needs overhauling; 608 another characteristically Ovidian idea, worth illustration; vi. 140 *horrenda stridere*: 'horrenda ist adverbialer acc. ntr. plur.'—is this current doctrine in Germany, or a momentary aberration? I hope the latter; 515 *iniciuntque manus*: it would be relevant to mention Ovid's predilection for legal phrases; 558 *sibi* needs defence; 708 the inversion is worth comment.

A glance at the enormous bulk of the commentary will set these criticisms in perspective. There is still a crying need for sound commentaries on many important ancient authors, but for various reasons, some good, some bad, few seem prepared to undertake the long and arduous labour demanded. Works such as Bömer's therefore, though they may have their imperfections, are entitled to our respect and gratitude. It is a pity that the publishers of the book did not give it paper to match the high standard of the printing.

Peterhouse, Cambridge

E. J. KENNEY

## TACITUS

RONALD SYME: *Tacitus*. 2 vols. Pp. xii+856. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 84s. net.

THE scholarly stalker generally comes up on Tacitus from behind, approaching him (like Pippidi) by way of Hellenistic historiography, to whose precepts he was, like his master Sallust, often strikingly faithful; or (like Walser) by way of Roman education in rhetoric and the strong marks which such education left on him; or even (like Mendell recently) through the artistic development of Tacitus' own style.

Syme's way is his own.

While many of us possess a *municipalis origo*, Syme, with New Zealand for his *patria*, is what the Romans would have called *provincialis*; and the preface of his book reveals that he has on the stocks 'a book begun many years ago, soon interrupted and not yet terminated—*The Provincial at Rome*'. In 1939 he published a book of striking novelty and immense importance, *The Roman Revolution*, and it is no doubt as clear to Syme himself as to others that that book owed much to his observation of certain European countries, in particular Germany, in the twenties and thirties of the present century. Syme's own experience, in fact, has confirmed for him the truth that in some degree 'all history is contemporary history'.

What, then, of Tacitus?

Instead of coming up on him from behind, Syme drops down on him from above, to find whether he too, when he was writing of Galba or of Tiberius, was not reflecting, consciously or unconsciously, his own contemporary world.

For the purpose of the inquiry it was necessary first to people that world, to

<sup>1</sup> To the passages cited by Frazer may be added Pepys's Diary for 28 May 1667: 'After dinner my wife away down . . . to Woolwich, in order to a little ayre and to lie there to-

night, and so to gather May-dew tomorrow morning, which Mrs. Turner hath taught her as the only thing in the world to wash her face with.'

depict Tacitus in the society of his times. Martial, Juvenal, Suetonius help a little; the writings of the younger Pliny help almost too much. And there are, particular field for Syme's own talent, the surviving inscriptions, from which there is so much information to be coaxed. For the year 97, for instance, inaugurated by the joint consulship of Nerva and Verginius Rufus, we knew already, from Pliny, the name of one suffect consul—Tacitus; now, with a new Ostia fragment (*A.E.* 1954, p. 220; Syme, pp. 640–2) we know the names of four others, one of them (Q. Glitius Atilius Agricola) a man whose career (including the date of the second consulship to which, unlike Tacitus, he proceeded) can be reconstructed in some detail from inscriptions, though literature has no trace of him. Syme has only to wave his wand, and Glitius Agricola takes his place in the history of the period side by side with many of his less important contemporaries, men who were in the history books already, only because they associated with the younger Pliny.

The leading figures in Roman public life at the end of the first century and at the beginning of the second were, like Tacitus, and his father-in-law, the *provinciales* and the *municipales* who, bringing their *parsimonia* with them, so improved the tone of their social surroundings that in this respect at least Tacitus could reflect (*Ann.* iii. 55. 6), *nostra quoque aetas multa laudis et artium imitanda posteris tulit*.

With the internal evidence of his own writing, the appearance of Cornelii, and the very rare appearance of Taciti in inscriptions to act as guides (pp. 611–24), Tacitus' own northern origins are made the quarry of scholarly detection. Not Cisalpine, but Narbonese Gaul; and, within Narbonese Gaul, perhaps Burrus' *patria*, Vasio. It is a breath-taking conclusion, even if it is inconspicuously qualified by the honest note (p. 623, n. 4); 'The preceding remarks . . . are not quite strong enough to prove the historian's 'patria'. It might have been some other city of Narbonensis, possibly the 'vetus et inlustris Foroiuliensium colonia' (*Agr.* 4. 1)—which, indeed, could be the *colonia* of Cornelius Fuscus, whom Tacitus treats favourably, when he could easily have represented him otherwise'. Cornelius Fuscus in that case must be shifted from Aquileia where (in *A.J.P.* 1937) Syme once placed him (pp. 683 f.).

Inscriptional evidence, again (*O.G.I.S.* 487), is the only source of our knowledge that Tacitus was proconsul of Asia—in 112/13 or 113/14 (pp. 664 f.). Knowing this, the reader feels that the fact might almost have been detected earlier from the *Annals* itself; Asia, as Syme points out, is given such recurrent prominence in the book.

What reflections are there in Tacitus' books not only of the general background, but of the particular history of the time when he was writing? To decide this it is necessary, first, to find when Tacitus did in fact write and publish his books. The *Agricola* and *Germania* are both dated exactly by internal evidence. In this short review the *Dialogus* (which Syme insists on dating late, preferably between 101 and 107) can be disregarded. The *Histories* and the *Annals* are what matter. Syme dates both works very late.

When the *Agricola* was published in 97, the *Histories* was already planned (*Agr.* 3. 3, a statement in which, for whatever reason, Syme evinces little interest). It was on the stocks in 106 (Pliny, *Epp.* vi. 16 and 20), even in 107 (Pliny, *Ep.* vii. 33), if the dating of Pliny's letters is reliable. Parts were no doubt the subject of recitations, and publication may have taken place in parts. Say 109 for the final date of publication (Syme, 120).

With more than a year devoted to going out to Asia, governing it, and coming home, and with a great deal of reading and, as Syme rightly emphasizes, a great deal of original research to be undertaken, Tacitus will have done well to finish the *Annals* by 116. *Quod nunc rubrum ad mare patescit*: this definition of the eastern boundary of the Roman empire in *Ann.* ii. 61. 2 has generally been thought stout evidence that the *Annals* were published before Hadrian's accession.

Syme will have none of this, for of contemporary reflections in the *Annals* he sees none more clearly than the reflection of the Emperor Hadrian himself. 'The *Annales* convey several warnings to the address of the Emperor Hadrian' (p. 517). Here one reaches the part of Syme's book on which, for all its ingenuity, cautious historians will return a verdict of 'Not proven'. It is hard enough to accept Syme's persuasion that, as Tacitus was a suffect consul in 97, he was perhaps consul when the disturbances occurred and present at the council which led to Nerva's precipitate adoption of Trajan, and that his experience of those days coloured what he wrote of Galba's adoption of Piso in the *Histories*. But there is no evidence (and little plausibility, surely) for the suggestion that *primum facinus novi principatus* (*Ann.* i. 6. 1) and *prima novo principatu mors* (*Ann.* xiii. 1. 1) were written not without allusion to the murder of the four consulars at the start of Hadrian's principate; that the account of Livia's intrigues for Tiberius' succession was coloured by recollections of Plotina's intrigues for Hadrian's; that caustic comment on Tiberius' unadventurous consolidation of the imperial frontiers was, in fact, comment on Hadrian's frontier policy; or that scornful reflections on Nero's Hellenism were aimed at Hadrian himself. If so, Tacitus was challenging a ruler a good deal more subtle, probably, than himself, and someone who would not be slow to see what was intended; so, if he died before he had time to revise the *Annals* for publication (and Syme offers good reasons for this suggestion), Tacitus will have been, on Syme's dating, like his father-in-law, *felix opportunitate mortis*.

Both in his approach to history and in the style of writing which he adopted Tacitus made Sallust his model. Expression after expression is lifted from Sallust; Poppaea Sabina's *nec absurdum ingenium* was, already, that of Sallust's Sempronia. Tacitus refers to Livy by name and also to historians who wrote, and whom he read, for the early part of the *Histories* and for the *Annals*; and it is a remarkable thing that, though it was unconventional in antiquity for an historian to praise his predecessors and though it was unusual in Tacitus to flatter anybody, and though at the start of the *Annals* he wrote caustically of the earlier historians of the period in general, for nearly every historian whom he mentions by name (except the elder Pliny) he has a courteous word of praise; and in Pliny's case the courteous words were no doubt part of his obituary notice, among the events of A.D. 79.

The works of these writers do not survive. But chance has preserved, in however corrupt a state, a history book which was too trivial for Tacitus to use or mention, that written by Velleius Paterculus. Syme at times forgets about him too: 'Of an enormous literary production, very little has survived, and nothing at all from the Roman historians who wrote in the hundred and thirty years that had elapsed since Livy set about his task' (p. 200).

But Velleius Paterculus must not be disregarded like this. When the importance of *obsequium* (loyalty to superiors), a word in constant use by Tacitus,



is stressed as a mark of the successful new administrator (e.g. p. 58) it may be noticed that the neatest—one had almost said, the most Tacitean—remark in literature on this particular quality is that of Velleius Paterculus on M. Agrippa (ii. 79. 1): *parendique, sed uni, scientissimus*. On p. 121, n. 2 it is implied that the *vivit vivetque semper* of Pliny, *Ep.* ii. 1. 11 is a reminiscence of *Agricola* 46. In fact it has a different history, and a longer one. Velleius ii. 66. 5 had used it in the nicest imaginable way of Cicero's memory—for was it not Cicero's own expression? Syme, p. 201: 'Sallust, however, Quintilian is emboldened to match against Thucydides.' Was it so bold? Velleius had done it already (ii. 36. 2): *aemulumque Thucydidis Sallustium*. The importance of all this lies not in any rehabilitation of the tattered reputation of Velleius but in the clear indication which it gives that a great deal of what seems to us to be original in Tacitus must certainly derive from the stock-in-trade of rhetorical teaching and from the historians (all evidently more important than Velleius) whose works are lost.

Few scholars alive can challenge Syme as a Latinist. When he writes, therefore, of Tacitus' literary style (pp. 340 ff.), he has incomparably good things to say. And there are interesting tables among the appendixes which show how Tacitus' vocabulary changed as he grew older, until at the end of the *Annals* he had shed the 'hopeful words'. Very occasionally the critic may be emboldened to challenge a statement of Syme in this field. Is he really on safe ground in dating Quintus Curtius (p. 218, n. 6) by the phrase, *longa pace cuncta refovente*? 'Certainly not Augustan', Syme states, quoting other uses from Tacitus and Juvenal alone. But what of Velleius Paterculus again? *Pannonia, insolens longae pacis bonis*, he wrote in A.D. 30 of Pannonia in A.D. 14 (ii. 110. 2).

Syme's book is immensely long: 856 pages, 183 of them containing 95 closely printed appendixes. Its critics may consider that it is insufficiently critical of Tacitus' weaknesses as an historian (for all its factual accuracy and stylistic brilliance, his account of Tiberius is a dreadful piece of historical misrepresentation); that it is not always well arranged (you read an account of Tacitus' career at the very start of the book, but it is only on the last page or two that you will discover where his family came from); and that its Sallustian style degenerates often from the obscure to the unintelligible.

Even its critics, however, will be relieved, as honest men, to have finished with their muted criticism, and to pay tribute to the noble qualities of a quite outstanding book. The present reviewer will not be the only reader whom it sent at once to read Tacitus again from cover to cover. Its erudition is overpowering. It is a book to use, and use again; and its usefulness is enhanced by the fact that its indexes are as near to being perfect as indexes can be. Finally, it is a book which contains an exciting forecast. It may be doubted whether Tacitus' suggestion at the start of the *Histories* that he might in old age write a history of Nerva and Trajan was much more than a gesture of politeness to Trajan; his suggestion in the *Annals* of a work to come on aspects of Augustus' rule was certainly serious (though it is hardly conceivable that A.D. 4 would have made a good starting-off point for the *Annals*); but the covert promise in Syme's preface of *The Provincial at Rome* must be honoured. There is a great deal in Tacitus to show what a good book *The Provincial* is going to be.



## LATIN FATHERS AND THE CLASSICS

HAROLD HAGENDAHL: *Latin Fathers and the Classics*. (Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia, vi.) Pp. 424. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1958. Paper, kr. 28.

LESS comprehensive than its title may suggest, this excellent book falls into three distinct parts: (i) The Apologists and Lucretius (pp. 9-88); (ii) Jerome and Latin Literature (89-328); (iii) Miscellaneous Questions (329-95).

(i) As the author points out, Lucretius' influence upon Latin literature is not commensurate with his merits as poet and thinker, and it was his fate to be used more intensely by adversaries than by adherents. Of this Arnobius and Lactantius are the outstanding instances. Several scholars have occupied themselves with his literary influence on Arnobius, who liked rare words; here the apologists' use of Lucretian thought is more fully examined. Rejecting the view that Arnobius was a converted Epicurean, Hagendahl shows how, in addition to exploiting Lucretius against paganism, he used scientific material not to recommend science but to demonstrate human ignorance, although he adopted some Epicurean notions, even on occasion against normal church teaching, as when he denied that the world was created for man's sake. According to Brandt, Pichon, and others Lactantius was anti-Lucretian in thought. In the main this is true, for he upheld Providence against Epicureanism, criticized atomic theory, and employed Cicero against Stoics and Epicureans in *De Ira Dei*, a work in which Lactantius differed in principle from Arnobius. But he used Lucretius in *ad hominem* arguments against Plato, Aristotle, and the Stoics, as well as against pagan polytheism. On the tricky question of Lactantius's silence about Arnobius, Hagendahl concludes that there is nothing to prove his knowledge of *Adversus Nationes*, but that, since the publication-date of this work is unknown and it could be roughly contemporary with Lactantius, we need not doubt the traditional master-pupil relationship. Of the earlier Latin apologists, Tertullian sometimes echoed Lucretian language, but Minucius Felix and Cyprian cannot be shown to have drawn upon him.

(ii) Everyone knows of Jerome's dream and everyone knows that he was the great scholar of the early western Church. Hagendahl minutely surveys his erudition and assesses his attitude to pagan letters. Sometimes he pricks the balloon of Jerome's vanity. His knowledge of secular writers in Greek is almost all, if not entirely, second-hand, and Rufinus could justly poke fun at his pretensions. Perhaps Hagendahl is unnecessarily hard on *De Viris Illustribus*, a useful work in which Jerome sufficiently explains what he is doing. Some Latin authors Jerome of course knew well—of the poets, Virgil above all, with much Horace, an interest in the satirists, Lucan, some Ovid (perhaps only tags), some Plautus and much Terence (was he not a pupil of Donatus?). Of prose writers there is much Cicero, a good deal of Quintilian, some Sallust, some Seneca. Not that he had not read others, but they do not bulk large, and much of his erudition is second-hand. He was not seriously concerned with philosophy, though his later years reveal an increased interest in Cicero's philosophical works.

How did the dream (about A.D. 374) affect him? Was he sincere in his effort to abandon pagan letters? Was he truthful when he said, fifteen years

later, that no secular author had been in his hands since then? This is no new question, but Hagendahl has a good deal fresh to say, especially in detail. Broadly, he substantiates Pease's conclusions that for a long time after the dream Jerome quoted only from memory and is still doing this in his earliest biblical commentaries (c. 386). Then he begins to read his classics again. There are new interests, quotations too long for a fifteen-year memory, and works not previously cited. From 393 (e.g. *Against Jovinian*) the change is undisguised, and it is openly defended in *Epistle* 70 of 397, though Jerome will still sometimes try to give the impression that he relies on memory, or will conceal his source. When he is frank, he says that a dream cannot be binding in conscience, and that the Greek Fathers, not to say Moses, Solomon, and Paul, used secular learning with advantage. He was not a hypocrite. Such inconsistency as remains reflects an inner conflict, never quite resolved. One thing he could not lose, a classically founded style, which Hagendahl highly admires. One can sympathize with Jerome when he feared that his long abstinence had ruined his style and removed *omnem sermonis elegantiam et Latini eloquii venustatem*. So back to Virgil, Cicero, and the rest!

(iii) Here Hagendahl interestingly explores the treatment of the *quattuor animi perturbationes* (*hinc metuunt cupiuntque, dolent gaudentque*) and the four virtues in the Latin Fathers, and points to some applications of pagan mythology to Christian belief, for instance Ovid on the four ages in Arnobius.

The interest of a book like this depends largely on the details, which are fascinating in small doses, though stiff reading at a long stretch. With great learning and labour Hagendahl has added many references to those collected before him and has detected many concealed near-quotations. At the same time, the book has a backbone, and the conclusions are firmly drawn. We must be grateful that it has been written in English.

Christ Church, Oxford

S. L. GREENSLADE

## CHRISTIAN LATIN

CHRISTINE MOHRMANN: *Études sur le latin des chrétiens*. Pp. xxii + 468. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1958. Paper, L. 5,500.

THE twenty-six studies in the present collection have all appeared elsewhere, though those originally published in Dutch have now been translated into English. The dates of their first publication range from 1932 to 1955, so that they enable the reader to follow the development of the author's thought. They are not arranged chronologically, but grouped loosely under three heads: 'Études générales sur la latinité chrétienne', 'Études sémasiologiques', and 'Études sur la langue et le style d'auteurs chrétiens'. The selection is representative of the scope of Professor Mohrmann's work, except that she has deliberately excluded everything published in *Vigiliae Christianae* (in the first nine volumes she published twenty-one articles and forty-four reviews, some of them lengthy). The volume opens with a bibliography of her work up to the beginning of 1957 (200 items), and is completed by four indexes—works cited, proper names, Greek and Latin words, and subject-matter—which make it admirably easy to consult. It is a pity that the original pagination is not recorded in the margin.

The central theme is always the study of Christian Latin as a 'special language' (*Sondersprache*). But many of the articles touch upon problems fairly remote from this central theme, though always connected with it. In 'Le problème du vocabulaire chrétien' (pp. 113-22, reprinted from *Scientia Missionum Ancilla, Mélanges A. J. M. Mulders*, Utrecht-Nijmegen, 1953, pp. 254-62) Mohrmann develops at length the parallel between the problems of the early Christians in the Latin-speaking world and those facing missionaries in modern times. One of the most interesting parallel cases, both for its similarities and its differences, that of the Jesuits in China in the seventeenth century, is not mentioned at all (cf. K. S. Latourette, *A History of the Expansion of Christianity* [1947], iii. 338-56; J. Needham, *Science and Civilisation in China*, i. [1954], 148-9). In 'Rationabilis—λογικός' (pp. 179-87, reprinted from *Mélanges Fernand de Visscher IV, Revue Int. des Droits de l'Antiquité*, v [1950], 225-34) the study of the history of a semantic calque leads to a new argument against the view that the Roman canon of the Mass was introduced from Milan. In 'Pascha, Passio, Transitus' (pp. 205-22, reprinted from *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, lxvi [1952], 37-52) we again find linguistic arguments used to solve a liturgical problem, the content of the Easter vigil in the early church. And in 'Epiphania' (pp. 245-75, reprinted from *Revue des sciences philosophiques et théologiques*, xxxvii [1953], 644-70) and 'Note sur Doxa' (pp. 277-86, reprinted from *Sprachgeschichte und Wortbedeutung, Festschrift Albert Debrunner*, Berne, 1954, pp. 321-328) the author is concerned with Christian Greek more than with Christian Latin. In 'La latinité de Saint Benoît' (pp. 403-35, reprinted from *Revue Benedictine*, lxii [1952], 108-39) she refutes, with a real firework-display of impeccable scholarship, the thesis of Dom Benedikt Paringer that the text of the *Rule* of St. Benedict in the Saint-Gallen and other early manuscripts cannot be authentic because of its divergences from classical Latinity. Her unrivalled knowledge of sixth-century Latin enables her to support with linguistic evidence the evaluation of the Saint-Gallen text made on other grounds by Ludwig Traube sixty years ago (L. Traube, *Textgeschichte der Regula S. Benedicti, Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie d. Wiss.*, 3te Classe, 21. 3, München, 1898).

Even the most narrowly linguistic of the articles are marked by the broad historical and sociological approach characteristic of the 'Nijmegen school'. The work of Schrijnen, Mohrmann, and their pupils has broken new paths in the study of late Latin. Of the value of their detailed semasiological and historical studies there has never been any doubt. But what of the theoretical background, the doctrine of Christian Latin as a 'special language'? Their argument, if I have understood it, is this. From the earliest times Latin texts written by Christian authors show a special vocabulary of names for things and concepts belonging to the life of Christian communities; names of concrete objects are mostly supplied by Greek loan-words, e.g. *episcopus*, *ecclesia*, *catechumenus*, *eleemosyna*, those of more abstract concepts by either lexicographical or semasiological neologisms, e.g. *saluator*, *glorificare*, *incarnatio* on the one hand, *lauacrum*, *spiritus*, *saeculum* on the other. All these constitute the 'direct Christianisms', and correspond, *mutatis mutandis*, to what one would expect to find in the technical jargon of any professional group (*Fachsprache*). But in addition we find in Christian Latin writings countless 'indirect Christianisms', i.e., names of objects or concepts not specifically Christian, which are found exclusively or almost exclusively in Christian texts; examples are *beatificare*,

*interrogator, fornicator, incorruptio, acceptibilis, desponsatio*. These 'indirect Christianisms' comprise not merely individual words, but typically Christian patterns of derivation, and even—though this point is not very well illustrated except in respect of occasional Hebraisms or Graecisms given currency by the early Biblical translations or the Vulgate—syntactical patterns. Now this renaming of ordinary objects and concepts is characteristic of the language of a group which is socially isolated within the community (*Sondersprache*). It serves both to mark off the group from outsiders and to give its members a sense of solidarity among themselves. One of the features of the Christian *Sondersprache* was that it rejected the inhibiting influence of the classical literary tradition, and thus had a freedom to innovate which pagan Latin did not enjoy. As Christianity spread in the west, so the special language of the Christians became the common language of the Latin-speaking world, the unique progenitor of the Romance languages and one of the two parents of medieval Latin, the other being the classical Latin of the schools. The whole development of Christian Latin was different from that of Christian Greek, which, after the Apostolic Fathers, was generally classicizing in tone and innovated but little. Greek has 'direct Christianisms' but few 'indirect Christianisms'.

There is obviously a great deal of truth in this. Christian communities in the west at first did feel themselves, and were in fact, isolated and discriminated against. The arguments of the apologists and pagan charges of *odium generis humani* and worse make this abundantly clear. And they reacted as a socially isolated minority always does by adopting for their internal use a technical, allusive, distinctive language. The eighth letter in the correspondence of Cyprian (it is not by Cyprian himself) must have been as unintelligible to the uninitiated as a company prospectus or the minutes of a Masonic Lodge.

But surely this isolation began to break down in the fourth century, if not earlier. Mohrmann (p. 35) says: 'on peut constater un accroissement continu du nombre des christianismes indirects, particulièrement au cours du quatrième siècle. Sans doute il y a un rapport de cause à effet entre l'édit de Milan, qui a modifié radicalement la position des chrétiens dans la société antique, et cette évolution linguistique.' One would expect the effect to be quite the opposite. May it not be that many of the 'indirect Christianisms' are illusory? In order to discover specifically Christian linguistic features, we should have to compare Christian Latin, not with pagan Latin *tout court*, but with a pagan Latin which, freed from the inhibition of the classical tradition with its ban on neologism, could reflect the rich variety of the spoken language. But there is scarcely any. So much that seems specifically Christian may be just late spoken Latin, which only Christians wrote.

To put the matter in another way, could one spot a Christian by the way he spoke about everyday matters? There is no evidence presented, and none the reviewer knows of, to suggest that one could. After all, most Christians in the early centuries were converted when their linguistic habits were already formed. And their everyday lives were of necessity lived in close and constant contact with non-Christians. 'Non sine foro,' says Tertullian (*Apol.* 42. 2), 'non sine macello, non sine balneis, tabernis, officinis, stabulis, nundinis uestris ceterisque commerciis cohabitamus hoc saeculum.'

Again, one of the functions of a *Sondersprache* is concealment (cf. W. Porzig, *Das Wunder der Sprache*, Berne, 1950, pp. 197–200 and literature cited there). But however much Christians might use a technical jargon in their own internal

discussions of theological and ecclesiastical matters or in their liturgy, such a *Sondersprache* would have been useless in the missionary activities in which they were so constantly and successfully engaged. Concealment was the last thing they wanted there. They had to be not merely intelligible, but persuasive. Any suggestion of 'double talk' would have weakened their appeal.

Though one may show a tinge of scepticism towards some of the more extreme formulations of the Nijmegen school, the contribution which it has made and is making to scholarship is beyond dispute. In every academic library, and on the bookshelves of every scholar of late Latin—Christian or pagan—Professor Mohrmann's book will have its place side by side with the collected studies of her distinguished predecessor and teacher, the *Collectanea Schrijnen*, Nijmegen, 1939.

University College, London

ROBERT BROWNING

### POLITICAL CLUBS AT ATHENS

FRANCO SARTORI: *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese del vi e v secolo a. C.* (Università di Padova, Pubbl. dell' Istituto di Storia Antica, iii.) Pp. 169. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider. Paper, L. 1,800.

IN this abundantly documented and eminently readable book the author discusses one of the most intriguing aspects of Athenian public life, the formation of associations by those of common interests to promote those interests and to strengthen their position against their (generally) political opponents, especially in times of crisis. Such associations, commonly called 'clubs' (cf. G. M. Calhoun, *Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation* [1913]), are generally connected in the minds of students of Athenian history with ideas of oligarchy, and it is part of Sartori's purpose to broaden the conception of these organizations, and elucidate their varying aims at different periods. The predominantly secret or semi-secret nature of these 'clubs' (*ἐπὶ τὸ λαθάνειν*) and their changing composition made them prime objects of vague and tendentious charges. In periods of internal strife and political crisis they were particularly liable to emerge from a background obscurity, and thus evidence of their existence and nature is at one time apparently abundant and at another time very scant, and hardly ever unambiguous. The author of a work on these clubs will rightly attempt to marshal all the evidence he can and squeeze the maximum from it. The terms used in the sources make for ambiguity and controversy: do *ἐταῖροι* always mean a *ἐταιρεία*, and even if so, what does this mean exactly? Is a *συνωμοσία* a temporary conspiracy or the name for an enduring association? The term 'club' so often used in English (a word, indeed, with special overtones) seems certainly inappropriate to some of the associations of individuals which Sartori mentions; 'party' would often seem a better term. The ambiguous Greek vocabulary is worth comment: in Plutarch, *Nic.* 11. 5 and *Alc.* 13. 7 the 'parties' or 'factions' of Nicias and Alcibiades are called *στάσεις*, though in the reference to Phaeax as intermediary in the affair of the ostracism of Hyperbolus the term *ἐταιρία* is used by Plutarch (*Alc.* 13. 8), and indeed the verb used in *Nic.* 11, and *Alc.* 13 (*συναγαγόντες, συνήγαγε*) is reminiscent of Isocrates xvi. 6 on Alcibiades (*ὥς . . . συνάγοι τὴν ἐταιρείαν . . .*) and of Pisander's advice (Thuc. viii. 54) to the *ξυνωμοσίαι* of 411 B.C., which from their description



sound like the commonly understood type of political club (πρότερον ἐν τῇ πόλει οὔσαι ἐπὶ δίκαις καὶ ἀρχαῖς; cf. Plato, *Theaet.* 173 d: σπουδαὶ δὲ ἐταιριῶν ἐπ' ἀρχάς . . .). Συνωμοσία, which Sartori argues was not always a synonym for ἐταιρεία, has various shades of meaning: 'conspiracy' in Thuc. vi. 27. 3 and 60 and in Plutarch, *Alc.* 18; 'conspiratorial association' in Thuc. viii. 54, Plato, *Rep.* 365 d (combined with ἐταιρίαί, and their purpose defined: ἐπὶ τὸ λανθάνειν; cf. Ps.-Andoc. iv. 4: οἱ τοὺς ἐταίρους καὶ συνωμότας κεκτημένοι) and Aristophanes, *Eq.* 476: ὕμῶν ἀπάντων τὰς συνωμοσίας ἐρῶ. In Lysias xii. 43 συνωμόται seem to be 'conspirators', since 'clubs' are referred to earlier (ἔφοροι κατέστησαν ὑπὸ τῶν καλουμένων ἐταίρων). 'Εταιρεία is sometimes clearly enough a political 'club'; cf. *Ath. Pol.* 34. 3, Lysias xii. 55, Isocrates iii. 54 (with σύνοδοι as in Aristophanes, *Eq.* 477) and Andocides i. 100 (apart from the play on ἐταίρησις). Elsewhere it is, more vaguely, an association of like-minded persons: Plato, *Rep.* 365 d, Isocrates iv. 79; or friends and supporters of an individual, cf. Isaeus fr. 22, 2 (Thalheim): πιστεύων ἐταιρείαῖς καὶ λόγων παρασκευαῖς. In Hyperides iv. 7-8 ἐταιρικόν (note verb συναγάγη) must mean something stronger than a 'club'—a conspiracy. 'Εταῖροι can also be ambiguous: in Thuc. viii. 92. 4 and Lysias xii. 43 (cf. καλούμενοι) certainly oligarchic clubs; less certain in Thuc. viii. 48. 4, Lysias xiii. 19 (ἐταῖρος καὶ ἐπιτήδειος), Andocides i. 54 and fr. 2 (πρὸς τοὺς ἐταίρους). Again ἐπιτήδειος is an ambiguous word in Xenophon, *Hellenica* i. 4. 12 and 18, and so is σύνοδος in Aristophanes, *Eq.* 477 and Plato, *Theaet.* 173 d. All these terms are liable to subjective interpretations, and contexts in which they appear must be the objects of individual judgement, but Sartori is right to include as much material as he can in which there is any possible hint of such organizations and their impact on Athenian affairs. It is also possible to go too far. He overdoes his detection of references, to these groups and the dangers they threaten, in the tragic and comic drama: *Aves* (pp. 101 ff.), *Helena* (p. 107), *Oedipus Rex* (p. 115), *Lysistrata* (p. 116), *Phoenissae* (pp. 129-30), *Ranae* (pp. 133-5), and indeed he himself admits the probable appearance of 'formule generiche e tradizionali'. He probably exaggerates the tone and significance, for example, of the *Ranae* as demonstrating the 'animo trepido ed ansioso' (133) of contemporary Athens, and reads into the vague scurrilities of an orator a good deal more than is certainly there (cf. the 'traitors' of Lysias xii. 36: see p. 135). His conclusions are such as might be expected in view of the difficulties of terminology and interpretation: he stresses the multiple and changing forms and objects of the ἐταιρείαί, and combats the narrow conception that ἐταιρεία always means συνωμοσία and is always to be associated with those of the oligarchic persuasion (154). There were, he claims, democratic and moderate oligarchic as well as extreme oligarchic ἐταιρείαί. The first organization of the latter 'in una forma quasi di partito regolarmente costuito' he ascribes to the days of Thucydides the son of Melesias; the fall of the Thirty Tyrants marked their end as a political phenomenon, and thereafter ἐταιρείαί or something like them appear only in connexion with the courts. Sartori's account of them after 403 B.C. is short (149-52). The reason for their disappearance, if they did disappear as a political instrument, merits a longer discussion than it gets, but perhaps this is an unfair criticism in view of the title of the book.



## THE ART OF WAR IN GREECE

F. E. ADCOCK: *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War*. (Sather Classical Lectures, vol. 30.) Pp. viii+109. Berkeley: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1957. Cloth, 22s. 6d. net.

THIS book combines in a brief space a profound and effortless scholarship, a clear grasp of essentials, and a charm of style as attractive as it is rare. It is true that war is a profoundly depressing aspect of Greek interstate activity, but, as the author points out: 'War claimed a place in their (the Greeks') lives whether they wished it or not. And to understand the past it is necessary to study what happened and why, as far as one can.' How much a study of the means and manner of war can contribute to an understanding of Greek history this book makes abundantly clear. Being a series of lectures published more or less as delivered, it avoids too much detail on the tactics of specific battles (though the significance of the most important is made clear) and on the minutiae of equipment (though here too the author has contrived to tell us what is essential). 'Greek' means the *polis* from the early stages of the hoplite army; 'Macedonian' includes observations on the military problems and practice of the Successor States; the two are closely integrated. A good deal of the substance of the first four chapters is common knowledge to the student of Greek affairs, but common knowledge is here so aptly expressed and highlighted that it appears new and striking. In chapter i (The City State at War) is treated in effect the hoplite army of the early Greek states, with an excellent account of its functions, limitations, and characteristics given in telling phrases. Here and in chapter ii the crucial periods of development and change (the struggle with Persia; the Peloponnesian War; the introduction of professional skills and the influence of such leaders as Epaminondas and Philip II) are well brought out. Chapter ii (The Development of Infantry) touches on the limitations of weapons other than those of the hoplite, and examines the effects of the rise in importance of light troops and the specialist, stressing the lesson of the Peloponnesian War: 'War on land now had a place for other arms and other methods than those of the hoplite phalanx.' A little more might have been said on the 'adventuring abroad of Greeks as mercenaries before the close of the fifth century' (23), and on Iphicrates and the lessons he may have learnt from his campaigning in Egypt (a point of chronology here?). Chapter iii (Naval Warfare) emphasizes some important points on the character of Greek warships, especially their limitations (37-38) and capabilities in comparison with merchant-ships. Certain factors, geographical and economic, are usefully stressed: the significance of Cyprus, the importance for Athens of the narrow seas between Aegean and Euxine, and the value of supplies of ship-timber. Much of this is well known, but here, as elsewhere in the book, well-known facts are admirably related to each other. The same is true of chapter iv (Cavalry, Elephants, Siegecraft). It is well to be reminded of the lack of horseshoes, of the insecure seat of the Greek cavalryman, of the problem of limiting cavalry pursuit, and, indeed, of the relative uselessness of elephants, expressed in characteristic fashion ('generals were slow to despair of elephants'). On siegecraft we are reminded of the unwillingness of Greek city states to face the heavy losses likely in direct assault on fortified places, though this is not the whole story. Chapters v (The Means and Ends of Major Strategy) and vi (Generalship in Battle) examine certain

wider issues in defence and offence: the influence of geography, finance, and politics on Greek war; the character and functions of the general, with well chosen illustrations from outstanding personalities. These two chapters, difficult to summarize, are the most valuable in the book. There will always be something to query in a collection of lectures which cannot take refuge in long qualificatory footnotes. For instance, is it true of the Greeks that 'when they were in the land of their enemies they helped themselves'? Was there much from which to help themselves? These chapters represent a remarkable feat of compression and careful judgement of the really relevant. This book should appeal to a wide public, and find its place in every university and school library.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

### DIONYSIUS OF SYRACUSE

KARL FRIEDRICH STROHEKER: *Dionysios I. Gestalt und Geschichte des Tyrannen von Syrakus*. Pp. 263; 8 plates, map. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1958. Cloth, DM. 24.

ALTHOUGH the elder Dionysius was among the most powerful and most influential characters in Greek history, this book is the first comprehensive monograph devoted to his achievements. Nor has a detailed history of Greek Sicily covering the period of his tyranny been published for more than half a century, if E. Pais, *Storia dell' Italia antica e della Sicilia*<sup>2</sup>, be excluded, which is apparently not known to Stroheker. The study of Sicilian history has received less attention than it deserves, largely because it has benefited relatively little from advances arising from modern developments in the use of documentary sources. The evidence available to Stroheker does not differ very substantially from that available to Holm and Freeman.

Anyone attempting a study of Dionysius must first make up his mind about the problems of the literary tradition, which are indeed formidable. Among the merits of this book is that in a long introductory chapter the author expounds clearly and firmly his opinions on these problems. There is very little contemporary evidence, and the secondary sources, even where tolerably abundant—and they are deplorably meagre on the later years of Dionysius—do not inspire confidence, being confined largely to the Sicilian narrative of Diodorus and a mass of widely scattered anecdotes. Stroheker rightly maintains that the anecdotes must be used with the greatest caution, especially as many attribute to Dionysius the vices traditionally associated with tyrants by rhetoric and philosophy; and his view that more confidence should be felt in those in which Dionysius is not represented as a typical tyrant (p. 22) is reasonable enough. It does, however, involve accepting the few anecdotes in which Dionysius is sympathetically drawn and rejecting the very large number in which he is not. The views of Stroheker on the sources of the Sicilian narrative in Diodorus xiii-xiv have already been expressed in *Satura O. Weinreich dargebracht* (1952), pp. 139-61, and these are further developed here. He maintains that Diodorus followed Timaeus, who in turn followed Philistus; and that the contemporary and, in his opinion, trustworthy picture of Dionysius by Philistus, which is known to have been favourable, was distorted by Timaeus, who introduced into it all the traditional features of the typical tyrant. This theory is ably and

persuasively presented, and if accepted, would account for some difficulties and inconsistencies in the narrative of Diodorus. It has, however, like most elaborate theories concerned with the content of lost works and the predilections of their authors, some grave weaknesses. Apart from the possibility that Diodorus may have made considerable use of works other than that of Timaeus, it convicts Timaeus both of unscrupulousness and of incompetence. The former charge is more credible than the latter. The violent attacks by Polybius and others failed to shake the high reputation that he enjoyed for centuries; and if, using the material supplied by Philistus, he had set out to damn the character and achievement of Dionysius, it is difficult to believe that he could not have done so without allowing the admiration of Philistus for Dionysius to be so frequently and so plainly visible as Stroheker supposes. Timaeus was not a Diodorus.

The application of these views on the literary tradition deeply influences the rest of the book. It causes Stroheker to suppress or tone down any suggestion that Dionysius acted discredibly, especially in subordinating the public interest to his own, or that he was suspicious or unpopular, or even that his failures were due to his own errors. Few will quarrel with Stroheker for rejecting the speech of Theodorus criticizing Dionysius (Diod. xiv. 65-69), which is doubtless a rhetorical invention by Timaeus. In other cases there is more room for doubt. The account of the secret agreement between Dionysius and Himilco whereby the latter was allowed to evacuate from Syracuse the Carthaginian section of his army (Diod. xiv. 75. 1-5) is dismissed in a parenthesis together with a footnote referring to its rejection by Beloch (p. 79 with n. 101). Though the motive attributed to Dionysius is very probably slanderous, to reject the whole story without discussion seems a little arbitrary: it is told with much circumstantial detail and, if it contains any element of truth, is of crucial importance. Even where Stroheker does not dispute the evidence, his interpretation of it tends to be somewhat too indulgent towards Dionysius: there are examples on p. 114 (the alliance with the Lucanians—its short duration is immaterial) and p. 117 (where the action taken against the Rhegines is surely a violation of the agreement concluded in the previous year).

It is perhaps impossible to explain satisfactorily why the energy and organizing ability of Dionysius, combined with his use of new techniques, did not bring him greater success against Carthage, why in apparently well-planned offensives victories were followed by defeats. The material resources of Carthage were greatly superior, but Greeks had defeated Carthaginians in Sicily before and were to defeat them again, and from 396 onwards Carthage was at times weakened by plagues and native risings. If Dionysius was always in earnest—and it is surely a calumny to suggest that he was not—he either under-estimated Carthaginian resilience or was a very indifferent general in the field or through lack of personal magnetism failed to win the devotion of his subordinates. The last of these explanations receives some support from Plato, *Ep.* vii. 331 d-332 c. Stroheker discusses and vindicates the remarkable perseverance of Dionysius in his efforts to expel the Carthaginians from Sicily (p. 180) but does not consider why the ultimate goal was never attained. More attention might also have been given to the question whether any degree of responsibility should be attached to Dionysius for the misfortunes of Greek Sicily in the decades following his death. Admittedly the collapse of his empire did not begin for some years (p. 182), but it is at least arguable that it was in some degree the outcome of his political and military system.

Inserted in the middle of the book is a chapter entitled 'Macht und Geist' dealing with the relations of Dionysius with contemporary literature and political thought and containing valuable discussions of his own literary work and of his contacts with Plato and Isocrates, together with their opinions about him. As Stroheker points out, a revival of interest among intellectuals in monarchy as a political institution took place after the Peloponnesian war, at a time when the fringes of the Greek world were providing some impressive examples of monarchy in operation. Dionysius was doubtless aware of the debate in intellectual circles about the merits of monarchy and may well have discussed the problem at his court; but it is less easy to believe that he deliberately sought, through his own literary activities or through patronage or through other means, to influence intellectual opinion in his favour by claiming to be a benevolent monarch and not a tyrant. His choice of names for his daughters—Dikaosyne, Sophrosyne, and Arete—hardly provides very cogent support for this view: it might more convincingly be used as evidence that he was deficient in sense of humour.

While some aspects of this book may legitimately be criticized, Stroheker has performed an extraordinarily difficult task with conspicuous skill and good judgement. His discussion of the relations between Dionysius and the Greek homeland (pp. 135–45) is an especially impressive example. He has produced an entirely coherent portrait of Dionysius, which is the logical outcome of his views on the sources. It would be possible to produce an equally coherent but totally different portrait by interpreting the evidence differently. Dionysius remains one of the most enigmatic figures in the history of the fifth and fourth centuries.

University of Manchester

H. D. WESTLAKE

## CAMPAIGNS AND CALENDARS

JEAN HUBAUX: *Rome et Véies. Recherches sur la chronologie légendaire du moyen âge romain.* (Bibl. de la Fac. de Phil. et Lettres de l'Univ. de Liège, fasc. cxliv.) Pp. 406; 10 plates. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper, 1,200 fr.

THIS is an excessively tedious book, and those who have the patience to plough through it will get little reward for their exertions. It starts from the pagan slander, mentioned by St. Augustine at the end of Book xviii of the *De Civitate Dei*, that St. Peter by magic arts had assured Christianity a duration of 365 years, i.e. of a year of years. After discussing this and some similar ideas current under the late Empire, the author passes (p. 52) to the speech of Camillus in Livy (v. 54), in which he states that the date is the year 366 from the foundation of Rome, in other words that its capture by the Gauls occurred A.U.C. 365. Here, then, we have another year of years, and something interesting might have been made out of the coincidence, if it is nothing more, perhaps enough to fill up an article of four or five thousand words. Instead of this, we are led through an immensely long discussion of the siege of Veii, which by p. 221 arrives at the famous scene of the interrupted sacrifice. Livy (v. 21. 8) tells us that just as the Romans were about to burst forth from their mine, a *haruspex* was informing the king of Veii *qui eius hostiae exta prosecuisset, ei uictoriam dari*;

the Romans snatched the entrails and Camillus completed the sacrifice himself. Now Plutarch (*Camillus* 5. 6), using Livy and confounding *prosecare* and *prosequi*, nonsensically renders *qui . . . prosecuisset* by τῷ κατακολουθήσαντι τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐκείνοῖς. To Hubaux, this indicates that he had a different version of the incident in mind; it is of course clear proof that he had before him the Livian text itself. As a result, wild work is made of the whole story, and that over many pages. It is but one of many passages in which the author proves that he has little competence in the ancient tongues. For instance, on p. 21 he has occasion to cite Ammianus Marcellinus (xxix. 2. 17), and essays to translate the words *malitia quendam exsuperantem* by 'dont la méchanceté dépassait celle d'un certain personnage', which he glosses in marvellous fashion. The author, *miles et Graecus*, had in mind the use of the indefinite pronoun in his own tongue, and meant simply ὑπερβάλλοντά τινα τῇ κακίᾳ or the like, the pronoun being in agreement with the participle, not its object. But even if the languages are taken one at a time, errors of the most ridiculous kind stud the pages. Thus on p. 270 we hear that 'Despoina était un des noms d'Artémis', and reference is made to Soph. *El.* 626. Anyone who looks at that passage will see that the epithet is used simply as a complimentary address to the goddess, as it might have been to any other. But to return to the argument, we pass to the episode in Silius Italicus (xiii. 115 ff.) in which a doe of portentous age, contemporary with the foundation of Capua, is chased by wolves into the Roman lines and there caught and sacrificed. This occupies pp. 264-79, and leads up to a discussion of the phrase *exta prosecare* which proves that Hubaux has little idea of what that phrase means. After an account of the Hirpi Sorani which incidentally shows no real knowledge of the perfectly genuine exploit of fire-walking, we reach the final section, pp. 296-367, in which sundry personages more or less historical are equated with that late and ill-attested figure Februarius, who, if there is anything but the imagination of Byzantine sciolists behind him, is an example of the common rite of driving out winter, infertility, ill-luck, or some undesirable thing, and might conceivably have been a popular Roman practice of some date.

How well read Hubaux is in modern literature may be judged by his discussing the murder of Remus without a mention of Wagenvoort (pp. 96 ff.) and speaking at length about the Roman calendar without using Nilsson. It would be tedious to list his absurdities of detail, his inverted pyramids of argument, his dogmatic assertions, generally quite wrong, and other absurdities. Enough to say that I have failed to find one redeeming feature in the bulky work, unless it be some good reproductions in the plates of statues found on the site of Veii.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

## FROM THE GRACCHI TO POMPEY

E. GABBA: *Appiani Bellorum Civilium liber primus*. Pp. xlii+446; map. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 4,500.

THE period covered by this book has naturally always aroused great interest; yet, apart from one slender volume (now wholly inadequate), no historical edition of the book has ever appeared. This has seriously affected both teaching (the period is a favourite in our universities) and historical inquiry—the



more so as *Forschungsberichte* have also been rare. Gabba's edition is therefore a landmark; and he was, of course, uniquely competent to undertake the task.

After a full introduction he sets out to give a detailed commentary on the book in the light of other sources and of modern work. This is done with the thoroughness and good judgement characteristic of the school of Pavia: all the source references are there, with brief discussion of variant accounts; and few of us will fail to learn of publications unknown to us. There is even a generous selection of the wrong-headed and the eccentric, usually with a gentle *meno probabile*. Throughout, readers will admire the editor's skill in compression. Five appendixes deal with points requiring detailed discussion (most important C. Gracchus' judiciary legislation and Sulla's *lectio senatus*); then comes a careful Italian translation (I have spotted only one error: ch. 12, *fin. αὐτίκα ἰδιώτης γενόμενος* is misunderstood—similarly in White), a rather disappointing index (bare page-references, not even covering the commentary), and a well-printed map of the Social War. There is no bibliography (works on Appian, editions, etc., are listed in the introduction). This fault is aggravated by the editor's style of citation. Thus Jashemski's *Proconsular and Propraetorian Imperium*, cited p. 165, next appears p. 214 as 'op. cit.'! Since users of Gabba's book will normally look up a particular passage, this practice will cause considerable inconvenience. A few pages of bibliography, collecting works cited, would have been helpful. It should also have been stated (since the Preface is dated 1953-8) that works published after the middle of 1956 have, on the whole, not been used. Since this book aims at giving a conspectus of opinions, this is important to the reader.

Misprints are almost confined to foreign citations and are mostly harmless. [P.] 52, [L.] 4 [of commentary] read '1924' for '1934'. 78, 3 read 'favorevole'. 201, 15 the Dictator is called L. Iulius Caesar. 25, 9 read 'L.' [not M.] 'Plautius Hypsaëus'. (Marcus, a more successful man, became *cos.* 125.) On the chronology, incidentally, Gabba has here taken Broughton's confused exposition too much on trust.

The Gracchi and the four great wars form the backbone of the book. For the Gracchi an analysis like this has long been needed; and, with some reservations on Gabba's views on Appian's sources (see this journal, 1958, pp. 159 f.), students of the period will find it indispensable. But the editor's finest achievement is the discussion of the wars: for one reader, at least, much that seemed incoherent has now begun to make sense under Gabba's handling of chronology and topography.

Naturally, the book will stimulate controversy. Only a few points can be mentioned. Gabba is no respecter of standard works: thus the tribunician lists for 100 and 99 are drastically revised (110 f.), and 81 is rightly accepted as the date of Pompey's first triumph (216). Yet even the most critical scholar cannot escape the influence of accepted error, especially in a period more beset with it than most. Ti. Gracchus' *modus agri* is given (26, 16 f.) as 500 *iugera* with 250 for each of the first two sons. This is the standard attempt to combine the figures 500 and 1,000 in our different traditions. It is methodologically unsatisfactory and (as Carcopino has shown) historically nonsensical. Anyhow, why not daughters too, at least? (Cf. Appian's 'πρῶτος γυναικῶν'.)—That the *lex Plautia Papiria* was a major enfranchising law (148 and 157) is a modern fiction, which we should not father on Appian and Velleius: the law is mentioned only by Cicero in his defence of the *adscriptus* Archias, and only as



dealing with *adscripti*.—The low census figure for 86 (157 and 200) is obviously due to the fact that Rome was cut off from the eastern provinces; it does not prove anything else.—Ofella's death (276 f.) cannot come in 80, when law and order had long been re-established. It belongs to 82, and the *lex annalis* he contravened was the pre-Sullan one (on which, see now Astin, *The Lex Annalis before Sulla* (1958)).—That Sulla's law kept consuls and praetors in Rome during their year of office (294) should not simply be stated as a fact: Balsdon (who should be cited) has demolished it.

Sometimes certainty is impossible. Gabba will not convince everyone that the epigraphical *Lex Agraria* is the third of Appian's laws (in ch. 27). The third law (Appian says) abolished all payments, so that ὁ δῆμος ἀθρόως ἀπάντων ἐξεπεπτώκει. The *Lex Agraria*, however, arranges for some *uectigalia*. That it abolished others (thus Gabba) is a *priori* assertion: it is not in our text.—The story (96 f.) of the 'consul Caepio' (as we must surely read, following both the chief manuscripts and the *difficilior lectio*), who pulled down L. Cassius' theatre, cannot be identified with a similar action by Scipio Nasica: it probably belongs to 125, when a Caepio (confused by Appian with the notorious *cos.* 106) and a L. Cassius were censors.—The reading ἐν τῇ Λιγυστίδι (214, 5) is hard to defend. Appian says that Metellus waited there from Cinna's capture of Rome until he joined Sulla. We happen to know that he spent some time in Africa; to say that he passed through Liguria on his way keeps neither to Appian nor to geographical probability. Linden's brilliant Λιβυστίδι is incontrovertible.—Finally, for some personalities and problems of the nineties, see now *Historia* 1957, pp. 318 f.

This is a very fine edition, well worth its rather high price. Let us hope that Gabba will continue to work on the elucidation of this period.

Durham Colleges, University of Durham

E. BADIAN

## CLIENTELAE

E. BADIAN: *Foreign Clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*. Pp. x+342. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.

THIS is a valuable and interesting contribution to the study of Roman history; it will, together with the more detailed preliminary inquiries which Dr. Badian has published in the journals, establish his place firmly among the younger generation of Roman historians. His choice of a title, however, though accurate, is perhaps not very happy, since it might suggest a study such as P. C. Sands's *Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic*. In fact, of course, Rome's allies in Italy were legally 'foreigners' (*peregrini*), and since their relations with Rome tended to develop from those of equals into those of clients towards a patron, they are considered at length in this work: indeed the Italians are the main subject of two of the six chapters in Part i, on Foreign Policy, and three of the five in Part ii, on Internal Politics. *Clientela*, one of the fundamental institutions of Roman private life, had a moral rather than a strictly legal character, of which the primary elements were the *fides* of the patron and the *officium* of the client; unlike *amicitia* and *hospitium*, which can exist only between equals, *clientela* marks a relationship between inferior and superior. Thus the Romans, long accustomed to thinking in such categories in

their private relationships, came naturally to regard their corporate relationship with other communities in like terms, and a foreign *clientela* emerged as Rome's power increased *vis-à-vis* that of other states, at first in Italy and then overseas.

The two somewhat diverse parts of Badian's study thus deal with different applications of a common attitude of mind. The first section surveys the development of client relationships in foreign policy and ends in 146/133 B.C. when these have hardened into a normal part of the administrative system. Here the so-called clients primarily considered are those in relationship with the *Populus Romanus*; they are dependent states which as a result of historical events owed Rome *officia* in return for *beneficia* received. They are clients in Rome's eyes because of the ways in which Romans were accustomed to think; they themselves may often have found it difficult to envisage what Rome meant by this relationship, not least because Rome's own ideas of what *clientela* should involve tended to alter. In this part individual Romans are considered chiefly as the executors of senatorial policy towards these dependent states. The second part deals with the *clientelae* of individual Roman families and leaders, which Badian believes became more important with the Gracchan reforms: henceforth the possession of personal connexions and political support outside Rome (not least in the rest of Italy) assumes greater significance. A large proportion of this part therefore is concerned with the relations of Roman leaders with the Italian allies. This whole method of treatment rests upon Badian's belief that in the earlier period Roman foreign policy was essentially the expression of a common purpose. In regard to many issues where others have detected traces of 'party' differences, Badian sees none (e.g. pp. 81, 89, 95, 98). Since even he naturally admits differences in regard to Rhodes in 167 and Carthage c. 150, the fact of such admitted divergencies of policy might suggest the need for greater caution for the earlier years of the second century when, as the present writer believes, the nobility will not always have been of one mind. But Badian goes even farther and argues that apart from the Italian question and the Jugurthine war, foreign policy was not a matter of 'party' controversy down to 70 B.C. (p. 288).

After discussing the meaning of *clientela* Badian starts by considering the organization of Italy before the Hannibalic War. Here he minimizes the importance of the *foedus iniquum*, which most scholars since Täubler have regarded as fundamental in the formation of the federation of allies: he argues that it does not belong to the period of the building up of the Italian Confederacy (even as late as 298 the *foedus* with the Lucani is more likely to have been *aequum*), while the clause which ordered an ally *maiestatem populi Romani conservare* is late and was probably not used in Italian treaties. In the next chapter he argues that the Roman conception of the *civitas libera* (in the sense of a city which enjoyed a freedom that was not precarious or limited and that rested not on a treaty but on moral rather than legal obligations) first emerged not in Greece in 197 under Greek influences but in Sicily in the First Punic War. It is then shown how this reliance by Rome on moral claims, on the principle of association without treaty, which accords with the basic character of *clientela*, was extended east of the Adriatic. This theory is attractive, but when Badian applies it to Saguntum and argues that Saguntum had no formal treaty with Rome, some doubts must arise. If Saguntum was merely trusting to Rome's *fides*, would not the later Roman annalists in their attempts to

dealing with *adscripti*.—The low census figure for 86 (157 and 200) is obviously due to the fact that Rome was cut off from the eastern provinces; it does not prove anything else.—Ofella's death (276 f.) cannot come in 80, when law and order had long been re-established. It belongs to 82, and the *lex annalis* he contravened was the pre-Sullan one (on which, see now Astin, *The Lex Annalis before Sulla* (1958)).—That Sulla's law kept consuls and praetors in Rome during their year of office (294) should not simply be stated as a fact: Balsdon (who should be cited) has demolished it.

Sometimes certainty is impossible. Gabba will not convince everyone that the epigraphical *Lex Agraria* is the third of Appian's laws (in ch. 27). The third law (Appian says) abolished all payments, so that ὁ δῆμος ἀπὸ πάντων ἐξέπεπτώκει. The *Lex Agraria*, however, arranges for some *uectigalia*. That it abolished others (thus Gabba) is *a priori* assertion: it is not in our text.—The story (96 f.) of the 'consul Caepio' (as we must surely read, following both the chief manuscripts and the *difficilior lectio*), who pulled down L. Cassius' theatre, cannot be identified with a similar action by Scipio Nasica: it probably belongs to 125, when a Caepio (confused by Appian with the notorious *cos.* 106) and a L. Cassius were censors.—The reading ἐν τῇ Λυγυστίδι (214, 5) is hard to defend. Appian says that Metellus waited there from Cinna's capture of Rome until he joined Sulla. We happen to know that he spent some time in Africa; to say that he passed through Liguria on his way keeps neither to Appian nor to geographical probability. Linden's brilliant *Λιβυστίδι* is incontrovertible.—Finally, for some personalities and problems of the nineties, see now *Historia* 1957, pp. 318 f.

This is a very fine edition, well worth its rather high price. Let us hope that Gabba will continue to work on the elucidation of this period.

Durham Colleges, University of Durham

E. BADIAN

## CLIENTELAE

E. BADIAN: *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)*. Pp. x+342. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. Cloth, 50s. net.

THIS is a valuable and interesting contribution to the study of Roman history; it will, together with the more detailed preliminary inquiries which Dr. Badian has published in the journals, establish his place firmly among the younger generation of Roman historians. His choice of a title, however, though accurate, is perhaps not very happy, since it might suggest a study such as P. C. Sands's *Client Princes of the Roman Empire under the Republic*. In fact, of course, Rome's allies in Italy were legally 'foreigners' (*peregrini*), and since their relations with Rome tended to develop from those of equals into those of clients towards a patron, they are considered at length in this work: indeed the Italians are the main subject of two of the six chapters in Part i, on Foreign Policy, and three of the five in Part ii, on Internal Politics. *Clientela*, one of the fundamental institutions of Roman private life, had a moral rather than a strictly legal character, of which the primary elements were the *fides* of the patron and the *officium* of the client; unlike *amicitia* and *hospitium*, which can exist only between equals, *clientela* marks a relationship between inferior and superior. Thus the Romans, long accustomed to thinking in such categories in

their private relationships, came naturally to regard their corporate relationship with other communities in like terms, and a foreign *clientela* emerged as Rome's power increased *vis-à-vis* that of other states, at first in Italy and then overseas.

The two somewhat diverse parts of Badian's study thus deal with different applications of a common attitude of mind. The first section surveys the development of client relationships in foreign policy and ends in 146/133 B.C. when these have hardened into a normal part of the administrative system. Here the so-called clients primarily considered are those in relationship with the *Populus Romanus*; they are dependent states which as a result of historical events owed Rome *officia* in return for *beneficia* received. They are clients in Rome's eyes because of the ways in which Romans were accustomed to think; they themselves may often have found it difficult to envisage what Rome meant by this relationship, not least because Rome's own ideas of what *clientela* should involve tended to alter. In this part individual Romans are considered chiefly as the executors of senatorial policy towards these dependent states. The second part deals with the *clientelae* of individual Roman families and leaders, which Badian believes became more important with the Gracchan reforms: henceforth the possession of personal connexions and political support outside Rome (not least in the rest of Italy) assumes greater significance. A large proportion of this part therefore is concerned with the relations of Roman leaders with the Italian allies. This whole method of treatment rests upon Badian's belief that in the earlier period Roman foreign policy was essentially the expression of a common purpose. In regard to many issues where others have detected traces of 'party' differences, Badian sees none (e.g. pp. 81, 89, 95, 98). Since even he naturally admits differences in regard to Rhodes in 167 and Carthage c. 150, the fact of such admitted divergencies of policy might suggest the need for greater caution for the earlier years of the second century when, as the present writer believes, the nobility will not always have been of one mind. But Badian goes even farther and argues that apart from the Italian question and the Jugurthine war, foreign policy was not a matter of 'party' controversy down to 70 B.C. (p. 288).

After discussing the meaning of *clientela* Badian starts by considering the organization of Italy before the Hannibalic War. Here he minimizes the importance of the *foedus iniquum*, which most scholars since Täubler have regarded as fundamental in the formation of the federation of allies: he argues that it does not belong to the period of the building up of the Italian Confederacy (even as late as 298 the *foedus* with the Lucani is more likely to have been *aequum*), while the clause which ordered an ally *maiestatem populi Romani conservare* is late and was probably not used in Italian treaties. In the next chapter he argues that the Roman conception of the *civitas libera* (in the sense of a city which enjoyed a freedom that was not precarious or limited and that rested not on a treaty but on moral rather than legal obligations) first emerged not in Greece in 197 under Greek influences but in Sicily in the First Punic War. It is then shown how this reliance by Rome on moral claims, on the principle of association without treaty, which accords with the basic character of *clientela*, was extended east of the Adriatic. This theory is attractive, but when Badian applies it to Saguntum and argues that Saguntum had no formal treaty with Rome, some doubts must arise. If Saguntum was merely trusting to Rome's *fides*, would not the later Roman annalists in their attempts to

palliate Roman conduct towards Saguntum have emphasized that there was no treaty? Though this clearly would not have exculpated Rome on moral grounds, it would have made a formal defence of her conduct easier: no treaty, and therefore no legal obligation and a soft-peddling of her lack of *fides*. In denying the Saguntines a *foedus* Badian relies on Polybius' reference to the people of Panormus (a *civitas libera*) as *σύμμαχοι* (i. 40. 1), but in this military context the use of the word might be general rather than legal (i.e. merely those fighting on the Roman side): in a context of legal obligations Polybius refers to Rome's *συμμαχία* with Saguntum (e.g. iii. 15. 8; 21. 5). Badian might quote references to a *πίστις-fides* relationship (e.g. iii. 15. 4), and since this review was drafted his case has been strengthened by the authority of J. A. O. Larsen in his review of Walbank's *Polybius* (*C.P.*, 1958, p. 248) in a discussion of *deditio*. Almost thou persuadest . . . yet it is difficult to believe that when Polybius says *συμμαχία* he does not really mean and believe in the existence of a treaty.

We cannot trace here how Badian skilfully works out the application of his theory of this earlier and essentially Roman conception of free *amici* to Rome's policy of 'the freedom of the Greeks' in a world where *αὐτονομία* and *ἐλευθερία* meant something different from *libertas*, how it proved inadequate for extension in Asia, and how protectorate developed into domination while *libertas* and *immunitas* were dissociated: by 146 B.C. all allies, 'free' or 'federate', have become clients, whose rights in practice are dependent less on law and treaties and more on Rome's interpretation and will. In dealing with the West Badian suggests that Rome did not begin to exploit Spain in 205, but decided on a permanent tribute only in 197 (cf. the small amount of silver and gold brought back in 198 by Manlius with the vast haul in 196): the new organization of 197 led to the Spanish revolt. But here Badian has surely overlooked the immense quantity (43,000 pounds of silver and 2,450 of gold) which Lentulus brought from Spain in 200 (Livy xxxi. 20. 7).

It is impossible here even to glance at many of Badian's views in the later part of his work, e.g. on the causes of the Third Punic War; Gallia Transalpina not organized as a province in the second century; Italians not covered by Tiberius Gracchus' *lex agraria* (surely right); Tiberius' early knowledge of Attalus' will due to the Attalid connexions of his father; Gaius' *sole* franchise law in 122; the date of the *lex Rubria* (rather too confident?); the motives behind Gaius' Asiatic tax-law; the role of Fannius. So one could go on drawing attention to numerous points on which Badian has interesting and often controversial discussions, but enough has been said to indicate that he has a fresh, confident, and sometimes contentious approach to many old problems and that all students of the Roman Republic will find in this scholarly and stimulating work much valuable light thrown upon Roman methods of thought and diplomacy in dealing with other states and upon the support which the leaders drew from their non-Roman clients.



## ROMAN HISTORY FROM COINS

MICHAEL GRANT: *Roman History from Coins*. Pp. 96; 32 plates, endpaper maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR GRANT's interest in the Roman imperial coinage continues unabated. *From Imperium to Auctoritas* was the great welling-up, whence a number of streams, some greater and some lesser, have flowed away in different directions. His present work is one of the lesser streams, though to say that is not necessarily to depreciate it. Lightly written and often sharply pointed, this little book threads together a series of lectures and essays with the purpose of showing 'some uses of the Imperial coinage to the historian'. That historian will not be a specialist student of the Empire, for whom Grant's earlier works have performed a far more valuable service. For the non-specialist, however, there will obviously be much that is novel and interesting; and it is to the non-specialist that this treatment is chiefly directed.

It is a pity, therefore, that in the search for effect (and effect is very important) accuracy has been sacrificed. To say, for example, of 'ancient governments' (without qualification) that they advertised their achievements and intentions on coinage (p. 11) is surely very misleading. The vast Persian Empire, with its colossal power; the tiny and highly competitive city-states of Greece; the relatively swiftly waxing and waning empires of Macedon, the Seleucids, or the Bactrian kings; the apparently ageless empire of Byzantium—of all of these the coinages were, in more or less degree, extraordinarily uninformative so far as deliberate advertisement of 'achievements and intentions' was concerned. The informative element in Roman imperial coinage is, indeed, a great and curiously constant exception. Nor was it just a product of imperial government. For (and this is a point which Grant might and probably should have brought out) nearly all the elements of the eloquent imperial coinage were derived from the increasingly lively coinage of the middle or later Republic. The informative element, in short, was a product not less of the Roman mind than of the political system under the Empire; and the Roman mind was as subtle as it was bold.

The need to simplify, in a short text of only 89 pages, has resulted in other possibly misleading statements elsewhere. Surely it is too much to say that sculptured imperial portraits existed, in great numbers, 'in every town and village of the empire'? Of the importance and frequency of the imperial portrait there is of course no doubt, but Grant might indeed have emphasized, even more than he has, the fact that the portrait-side of a coin was regarded essentially as being more potent than the often topical reverses. The emperor's authority (warlike or administrative or priestly) was all-pervasive, and for every sculptured reminder of this—and there were far fewer than he suggests—there were thousands of reminders in the form of coinage.

On questions of purely aesthetic judgement one has no right to quarrel, as when Grant says of the coinage of Nero that it was 'perhaps finer than coinage has ever been since'. But on some matters of interpretation there is obviously room for disagreement. Nero's *Virtus* type—succeeding to the initial 'constitutional' types on his gold and silver—is surely not, as Grant implies (p. 29), a side-glance at Paulinus' activities in Britain. *Virtus* meant that Nero's manhood was now the basis for his claiming the absolute autocracy which he had been



denied by the Seneca-Burrus régime; *virtus*, in fact, was the symbol of manly potentiality, such as might be looked for in a *princeps*. Then again, in his estimate of the accuracy to be postulated in architectural designs on Roman coins Grant has over-emphasized (p. 64) the representational accuracy of the die-engravers. Mounting evidence appears to suggest that the average designer was at pains (certainly in the East and probably elsewhere too) to reproduce clearly some one of a number of distinguishing features in a given building, and that—let us say—three successive issues of a coinage might well portray that building by means of three such different features.

On the question of mint-organization for early imperial coinage (p. 83) Grant is not either clear or even, perhaps, just. It is difficult to know what he means by saying that 'there is a tacit conspiracy among western scholars . . . to ignore the possibility of eastern mints'. No conspiracy, tacit or otherwise, has hindered the efforts made by many—Grant included—to identify such mints, of which, for gold and silver, 'the location . . . is a problem for the future'. Nor has Grant himself, here or elsewhere, done more than postulate a number of gold/silver mints in the west. They have scarcely, if at all, been named. How many coin-dies, found today, make a mint? For example, 2½ pairs at Calahorra; two dies at Nîmes. Do these add up to a gold/silver mint at Calahorra and another at Nîmes? If so, is it not a little remarkable that Rome and Lyons—obviously very large mints indeed—have produced no dies, unless it is for the very good reason that a self-respecting mint took care that its dies did not lie about and get lost or stolen? When all is said and done it would probably be better to abandon accusations of conspiracy and get down to the infinitely tedious and endless (though ultimately rewarding) job of studying in detail large numbers of the coins themselves. Only so can their groupings be firmly established, and the relationship of mints to metal-sources—surely most important—be simultaneously considered.

The book is well illustrated by plates which are varied, well chosen, and clearly reproduced. Their non-sequential numeration is often irritating, and their mounting (cf. pl. 8, nos. 4, 5, and 8) unprecise; but they put together, in an interesting, comparative manner, a large body of stimulating material.

*Ashmolean Museum, Oxford*

C. H. V. SUTHERLAND

## TROY

CARL W. BLEGEN, CEDRIC G. BOULTER, JOHN L. CASKEY, and MARION RAWSON: *Troy: Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII*. Vol. iv, Part 1 (Text). Pp. xxvi+328; Part 2 (Plates): 380 figs. Princeton: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1958. Cloth, 288s. net.

HERE, long awaited, is the fourth and final volume of the publication of the Cincinnati excavations at Troy. There is no need to praise again the full, careful, and objective presentation of the material; we must, however, congratulate both the sponsors of the expedition, Professor and Mrs. W. T. Semple (to whom the volume is dedicated), and Professor Blegen and his many highly skilled collaborators, on the completion of their monumental work. Its execution must surely have demanded the generalship of the Atridae combined with the resourcefulness of Odysseus. The volume does not indeed say the last word

on Troy; for separate monographs in the same series are yet to come, chiefly concerning Troy IX (the Hellenistic and Roman city); but it completes the account of Troy, so far as revealed by the Cincinnati expedition, down to the time of Alexander. The settlements discussed fall into three distinctly separated phases: Troy VIIa and the first stage of VIIb belong culturally rather with Troy VI; after that, *fuimus Troes*: the second phase of VIIb, the beginning of which is dated in terms of imported pottery to the end of Mycenaean IIIc 1, shows the intrusive Knobbed Ware (*Buckelkeramik*) and other types of material suggesting influence from the direction of the Danube; Troy VIII is the Greek colony, beginning around 700 B.C. after perhaps four centuries of non-occupation of the site; its foreign contacts are primarily with the East Greek cities, and in less degree with Athens and Corinth.

What concerns us most is Troy VIIa: *hac steterat Priami regia celsa senis*—but that is to anticipate conclusions, which the report does not do. Troy VI had been destroyed by earthquake; in rebuilding, the walls were repaired, but the large separate buildings of VI were succeeded by numerous small houses crowded close together, with only party walls between them, filling the belt that had previously lain empty between the great city walls and the first inhabited terrace within. Blocks from the earthquake debris were re-used, but in general the Troy VII houses were of unworked stone; all suggests haste, economy, and the need to house more people within the city's defences. Another prominent feature of the VIIa houses is the large *pitthoi* for food storage sunk into the floors; their numbers as well as their placing imply a crowded use of the living-space available. The characteristic grey Minyan ware of Troy VI continues into this phase, accompanied by a distinctive Tan Ware; imported Mycenaean pottery is less abundant than before. The duration of the settlement was short; the excavators suggest less than a century, perhaps only a generation; and it ended in violent destruction: everywhere was evidence of buildings deliberately ruined and destroyed in fierce fires; in several places skeletons in street or doorway bore witness to the savage event. The date of the settlement depends on the imported Mycenaean pottery; there is a much lower proportion of Myc. IIIA than in Troy VI; and there is none which is as late as Myc. IIIC. Thus Troy VIIa lived out its life before the transition from Myc. IIIB to IIIC. That transition is still not firmly datable. Furumark's figure of 1230 B.C. on his own evidence has a wide margin of uncertainty. It will therefore be wise not to quote Blegen as dating the sack of Troy VIIa at '1240 B.C.'; the date he really gives us is 'Myc. IIIB'. If, as this reviewer believes, the Myc. IIIB style continued into the twelfth century, the 'absolute' date might fall as late as the 1180's.

For the identification of VIIa with the Homeric Troy the precise figure is not important. The Greeks were familiar with a great ancient city in this part of north-west Asia Minor, a city which they called Troy; archaeology shows that the citadel at Hisarlik was the only such city in that area; *ergo* it is what the Greeks called Troy. Troy, the Greeks said, was sacked and burnt at a date somewhere near what we call 1200 B.C.; archaeology confirms their statement. That is what we mean by saying that Troy VIIa is the 'Homeric' Troy. It is as simple as that. If anyone still hides his head in a hole and says there never was a Trojan War, we should, but for charity, leave him there.

The historicity of the Trojan War has of course been long accepted by most classics; the evidence of these excavations has, moreover, been familiar in

outline for some years through preliminary reports and lectures. But with this definitive presentation before them *all* classical scholars will do well to reassess their approach. Had the Greeks forgotten the Trojan War it would not matter to us now; but they did not, and the event, with all its triumph and tragedy, is at the roots of Greek thinking about national and personal destinies.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge

F. H. STUBBINGS

## GREEK INSCRIPTIONS AT LEYDEN

HENRI WILLY PLEKET: *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum van Oudheden at Leyden*. Pp. xvi + 104; 16 plates. Leyden: Brill, 1958. Paper, fl. 30.

THIS handsome volume completes the catalogue of the Greek inscriptions at Leyden, acquired through various members of the Dutch commercial colony at Smyrna during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The previous publications of the contents of the Rijksmuseum (by L. J. F. Janssen, 1842, and C. Leemans, 1886 and 1890) dealt with about 80 texts in all, and a further 70, acquired between 1890 and 1902, are now published in a worthy form, with photographs of each stone (except two already illustrated elsewhere) and an ample and scholarly commentary. Moreover, the contents of the earlier catalogues are conveniently summarized in two appendixes, with their bibliography brought up to date and photographs of selected items. It is regrettable that the provenance of many of these stones is still uncertain, as the Museum inventory attributes most of them to Smyrna, even when internal evidence in some cases proves this to be incorrect.

No less than 55 of the 70 texts here published are epitaphs, of varying degrees of interest. Nos. 1 and 2 commemorate gladiators; no. 4, from Ilium, mentions two *φράτραι*, *Πηγάσων* and *Φιλοκεσαρέων*; in no. 5, *οἱ φιλαγριππαὶ συμβιωταί*, who erect the tombstone, are interpreted as an association for honouring the memory of Agrippa as a benefactor, and not as a divine being. Nos. 8 and 50 concern tomb-chambers, with the allocation of *ἐνσόρια* (compartments for sarcophagi, curiously not included in the index); no. 10 is for a physician from Tieion in Paphlagonia, who died at the age of nineteen, and nos. 66-69 are metrical epitaphs already published by Peek in his *Griechische Versinschriften* (vol. i, nos. 874, 1540, 1545, 1423 respectively).

Among the *Decrees*, no. 57 is of outstanding importance, and is discussed with the fullness that it deserves (pp. 49-66). It consists of a rescript in Greek in the names of Augustus and Agrippa, as consuls (27 B.C.), ordaining that *τόποι δημόσιοι ἢ ἱεροὶ* and *ἀναθέματα* (as convincingly restored by Pleket) in the cities or in the territory of each must not be removed or purchased or received as gifts; any such property must be restored to its real owner, under orders from the provincial governor. This is followed by a letter in Latin from the Proconsul [L.] Vinicius to the city of Cyrene requiring that the *fanum Liberei Patris* be restored to the ownership of the god by one Lysias, who had acquired it, apparently by the process of *πράσις ἐπὶ λύσει*. Then comes the (incomplete) Greek version of the same letter. For this direct interference by Augustus in the affairs of a Senatorial province, more than twenty years earlier than the familiar instance at Cyrene, Pleket finds the legal basis in his *imperium consulare*.

The only other substantial document (no. 58) consists of a number of small fragments, some of which have been pieced together, from a series of letters and regulations concerning the *θυμελική σύνοδος τῶν Τεχνιτῶν*. Little continuous sense can be elicited, apart from the mention of copies, sent by order of Antoninus Pius, of originals kept in the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, and, lower down, a date in Latin with the names of the consuls of A.D. 150. There also seems to be a passage dealing with authorized days for sacrifices (fragments HIKL, ll. 12 ff.), where we read *κατακλίσεις ταῖς γ[ενεθλίου]ς τῶν Σ[εβαστῶν ἡμέραις]* . . . *Παναθηναίους* . . . *αὐθις ποτε ψηφισθησομέν[αις ἡμέραις]* (?) (I restore *γ[ενεθλίου]ς* for Pleket's unconvincing *γ[ενομέναι]ς*). In no. 59 we have, presumably, a ruling by an official concerning a dispute over a lease of land, likewise incomplete, where Pleket has needlessly mystified himself over the last words of the text, *διδάξετέ με* ('you must inform me'), which he tries to restore as an aorist [*ἐ*]*διδάξετέ με* [*sic*].

A few other improvements may be suggested, mostly on the evidence of the photographs: in no. 57, l. 4 *vellent* not *vellint*, l. 5, *inscriptum*. In no. 62, l. 6, which seems to be an honorary inscription rather than a decree, we must read *κεχειρηγοτημένου ἀρχ[οντος]*, not . . . *μένον ἀρχ[οντα]*, and in l. 9 for Pleket's improbable *εὐκοσ[?]μίας* preferably *ταμίας τοῦ Βρ[ευσείου]* (?). In no. 63, l. 10 his objection to *[π]αυδίων* seems unnecessary, as the *π* appears fairly certain, and in no. 64, l. 5 . . . *γγι τοῦ συνε[δρίου]* is surely to be restored as *τῷ ὕσπλ[η]γγι, κτλ.*; in view of *διάλωμα* [*sic*] in l. 5 this stone may well refer to the allocation of seats in the *συνέδριον*.

The author's concise and lucid English makes for easy reading, and the few unidiomatic turns of phrase do not obscure the sense. Misprints are commendably few (e.g. wrong accents on pp. 6, note 3; 65, note 5; 77, l. 4, and l. 11 of no. 65; and p. 79, l. 1; 'Oproamas' (p. 78); and *I.G.* vii. 1 (p. 65) should be *I.G.* v. 1). Adalia 'in Phrygia' (pp. xiii and 47) is a curious slip for 'in Pamphylia'.

A. M. WOODWARD

## ROMAN PORTRAITURE IN THE THIRD CENTURY A.D.

BIANCA MARIA FELLETTI MAJ: *Iconografia romana imperiale da Severo Alessandro a M. Aurelio Carino, 222-285 d. C.* Pp. 309; 209 figs. on 60 plates. Rome: L' Erma di Bretschneider, 1958. Paper, L. 11,000.

DURING the third century of our era, when the series of public state-reliefs shows a virtually complete blank between Septimius Severus at the one end and Galerius and Constantine the Great at the other, when coin and medallion reverse-designs become (with a few outstanding exceptions) progressively more repetitive and stereotyped and less informative, imperial portraits assume a new and unprecedented importance as our most significant surviving documents of Roman official art. That the works of this epoch were far from decadent and often brilliant is immediately evident to anyone who turns the sixty pages of plates that illustrate the book here reviewed—plates in which most of the best and more significant material, sculptural, glyptic, and numismatic, has been assembled. The photographs unfold an intriguing tale of changing

iconographic taste—schematization of the features, hair, and beard from Severus Alexander to Gordian III, the revival of a ruthless realism under Philip the Arabian and Trajan Decius, a new 'baroque' under Gallienus, a wave of pictorial realism under Postumus, Tetricus, and Claudius Gothicus, followed by a return to schematization, lightened by realistic touches, from Aurelian to Carinus, and finally the splendid, classical idealism of the medallion-likenesses of Magnia Urbica (fig. 205).

Part i of the book consists of a bibliography and of *fonte e testimonianze*, that is, of the literary and epigraphical sources of our knowledge of the life and appearance (where recorded) of each imperial person of the period. Part ii, the main bulk of the volume, contains the catalogue of all the known portraits that have been identified with each of those individuals (of whom there are sixty-five in all), whether with unanimity or with doubt on some critics' part or even erroneously. A brief biographical note prefaces the list of portraits in every individual's case; after that comes an account of *iconografia monetale*—our sole material evidence for the likenesses of some princes and empresses; and then the sculptural and glyptic portraits numbered in sequence. Size, material, restorations, provenance (where known), description and discussion, bibliography form the pattern of each of the sculptural entries.

This is not the place for detailed comments on the author's attributions of individual portraits. Two points only can be raised. First, a photograph should surely have been reproduced of the well-known bearded head, crowned by a leonine mane of hair, in the National Museum in Athens, identified by some (pp. 230-1, no. 304), and in the present reviewer's opinion rightly, as Gallienus. Secondly, under the heading of Hostilianus (p. 199) should now be included the celebrated Ludovisi battle-sarcophagus, the central figure on which has recently been shown to represent that prince by H. von Heintze (*Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts: Römische Abteilung*, lxiv [1957], 69-91), by criteria that must convince even those who, like this reviewer, receive with scepticism the elaborate argumentation on which her picture of Hostilianus as an ardent Mithraist is based. We have, then, from the third century a trio of monumental marble sarcophagi ranking high in the sculptural series of imperial portraits—the Praetextatus Catacomb piece depicting Balbinus and his empress (pp. 142-3, no. 136; pls. 15, fig. 50; 16, figs. 51-52), the Acilia piece in the Museo Nazionale Romano delle Terme depicting Gordian III (pp. 148-9, no. 147; pl. 17, fig. 56), and now the Ludovisi piece.

The book will not be an easy one to use. Each page should have been headed with the name of the imperial person whose portraits are discussed on it. Page-references to the text should have been given against each figure in the index of illustrations. And at the bottom of each plate should have appeared the names of the persons whose portraits are shown on it. Since the numbers of the figures do not correspond with those of the items in the catalogue, the student perusing the plates and wishing to turn up the account in the text of any given item will find himself involved in not a little tiresome and time-wasting hunting.

The general standard of the plates is high. But the failure to indicate the scale of the reproductions of glyptic and numismatic portraits, some of which are particularly fine, is most unfortunate.



## A SCHOLAR NATURALIST

RUTH D'ARCY THOMPSON: *D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, The Scholar-Naturalist, 1860-1948*. Pp. xi+244; 9 plates. Oxford University Press, 1958. Cloth, 25s. net.

'SCIENCE and the Classics is my theme today; it could hardly be otherwise. For all I know, and do, and wellnigh all I love and care for (outside of home and friends) lies within one or the other; and the fact that I have loved them both has coloured all my life, and enlarged my curiosity and multiplied my inlets to happiness.' This passage, with which Thompson began his presidential address to the Classical Association in 1929, is rightly described by his biographer as the key to her father's life and thoughts.

Much of his classical training Thompson owed to his father, who was for many years Professor of Greek at Galway. His interest in biology was stimulated by his grandfather, John Gamgee, 'The Father of the Veterinary Profession', in whose house he spent his childhood. There is nothing better in this agreeable book than the description of the early days in Edinburgh and the visits to Galway. A letter from Thompson gives us the very essence of an Irish holiday: 'On Monday we sailed over to the Co. Clare, and he and I walked home round the Bay. Today we are going to the Races, and tomorrow and the rest of the time, I haven't a notion what we shall do.'

Miss Thompson skilfully keeps the balance between domestic affairs and the details of a long and active career as she guides her narrative through the struggle at Dundee to build up a department and the College itself, past the vivid episode of the Behring Sea voyages, and so to the removal to St. Andrews. The diffusion of interests and a reluctance to 'struggle for place or promotion' made progress slow. As an old man Thompson wrote: 'It is very hard to combine ambition with perfect scrupulousness and integrity; in fact it can't be done.' We admire him for his courage and honesty in acknowledging the dilemma and making the harder choice. Nevertheless, his ambitions were ultimately fulfilled; his books were written, his qualities recognized and honoured.

What we miss in this biography, and what is perhaps too much to expect, is a living portrait of the man himself. We hear of his almost hypersensitive kindness to students ('he took a nervous girl round the Museum encouraging her to talk about the birds and beasts she saw in the cases. When he left her he said, "Oh by the way, don't worry about your oral, you've passed very nicely this afternoon"'). Of his dealings with his colleagues, and particularly with his fellow members of the Senate, we learn little. We have an attractive picture of his life at home in St. Andrews; we are told of his inconsistencies (he was patient and impatient, just and unjust), and of some of his foibles—his anxiety to pay all bills on the day they arrived and his tendency to retire to bed if his wife was ill. But these details are not all unique nor does their rehearsal suffice to create a character. A less excellent parent might have been an easier subject to portray: this is a proposition the partial truth of which is sadly recalled by Miss Champion's portrait of her father, G. G. Coulton. However, Miss Thompson has written a book which scholars and scientists will enjoy and appreciate, and in which they will find vital issues to discuss.

The author modestly refrains from stressing the durability of Thompson's



classical works. Yet the two Glossaries seem likely to serve our needs for many years to come, and the chapter on Aristotle and natural science in the *Legacy of Greece* keeps its freshness and elegance unimpaired. The preface to the Oxford translation of the *Historia Animalium*, brief as it was, initiated a new and important stage in the discussion of the chronology of Aristotle's works, as Sir David Ross has recently explained (*P.B.A.* xliii [1957], 64-65). These are enduring achievements.

The most substantial of his biological studies, the long essay on *Growth and Form*, is discussed by Professor Medawar in an appendix. Classical students will feel that, just as only a biologist could have written Thompson's classical works, so too only a Greek scholar could have written this kind of biology, in which natural forms are explained in terms of geometry. There is, however, a more cogent reason for reading *Growth and Form*. Professor Medawar believes that it is 'beyond comparison the finest work of literature in all the annals of science that have been recorded in the English tongue'. That its influence persists as 'a signpost, directing men on to distant places' is strikingly revealed by a remark which was recently made in a *Times Supplement* on the National Health Service: 'Hospital architects are now studying D'Arcy Thompson's famous book, *Growth and Form*.' With what purpose or effect they do so was not clearly stated, but Thompson, who at Dundee interested himself in hospital welfare, would have been delighted to know that two more of his diverse pursuits had been reconciled and integrated.

University of Bristol

D. E. EICHHOLZ

## SHORT REVIEWS

W. B. STANFORD: *The Odyssey of Homer*. Vol. ii (Books xiii-xxiv). Second edition. Pp. xciv+453; 3 plates, 2 text-figs. London: Macmillan: 1958. Cloth, 12s. net.

PROFESSOR STANFORD's two-volume edition of the *Odyssey* made its first, and very welcome, appearance in 1947-8 (cf. *C.R.* lxii [1948], 115-17 and lxiv [1950], 33); and it is an index of the value which its users have set upon it that a second edition of the second volume should have been called for within ten years. It is understandable that the new edition is little changed in comparison with its predecessor; new sections on Mycenaean Greek (pp. xlix-l) and on verbal aspect (p. xciv) have been added to the introduction, and there are a number of changes in the substance of the introduction and notes, as well as some important additions to the 'Addenda and Corrigenda' (pp. 437-9). But all these changes have had to be made without changing the pagination, except at the very end, where the bibliography now extends on to p. 453; and in consequence some useful material (especially certain

pieces of information which were to be found in the 'Addenda and Corrigenda' to the first edition) has had to be jettisoned. It is presumably also the difficulty of changing the plates which has made it difficult for Professor Stanford to include up-to-date references to work which has appeared since 1948; but the result is to suggest that there has been less activity in Odyssean studies in the last decade than we have in fact experienced. (A reference to the bibliography by H. J. Mette in *Lustrum* i [1956], 7-86 might have helped to fill this particular gap.)

J. A. DAVISON

University of Leeds

WIKTOR STEFFEN: *Studia Aeschylea praecipue ad deperditarum fabularum fragmenta pertinentia*. (Archiwum Filologiczne, 1.) Pp. 117. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1958. Paper, zł. 20.

Is it worth while, in the many cases where certainty is not attainable, to supplement

fragmentary texts and to reconstruct the plots of lost tragedies? Perhaps; but if so the attempt should be made only by those whose knowledge of Greek language, style, and metre is reasonably good and whose judgement of what is and what is not probable or possible is reasonably sound. To this class Mr. Steffen does not belong. He is a diligent reader of other scholars' work; he knows Aeschylus' language and metre rather better than he does those of the Lesbian poets (see D. L. Page in *C.R.* lxx [1951], 235); he often has the strength of mind to leave a fragmentary line without a supplement; and many of his guesses at facts that cannot be known cannot be refuted (any more than they can be substantiated). But that is all that can be said for him. I have searched his book in vain for any positive contribution to knowledge; and I have found the task even more irritating than it need have been, because Mr. Steffen does not trouble to distinguish between his own supplements and those of others.

The only essay in the book not concerned with fragments is an attack upon A. Dieterich's conjecture that the list of plays found in two Aeschylean manuscripts had originally a fifth column that is now lost. It is true that W. Schmid and P. Mazon believed this; but since Wilamowitz dealt adequately with it in a single sentence (*Aeschyli Fabulae*, 1914, p. 8) and Gilbert Murray followed suit (Oxford text of Aeschylus, 2nd edn., 1955, pp. 375-6), Mr. Steffen could have saved himself the trouble.

HUGH LLOYD-JONES

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

FOLCO MARTINAZZOLI: *Sapphica et Vergiliana*. Su alcuni temi letterari della tradizione poetica classica. Pp. 167. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1958. Paper.

THE fragment of Sappho and the line of Virgil which form the kernel of this short but eminently readable work are unconnected with each other, but both contribute suitable material for the study of certain recurrent motifs in ancient poetry. The reader must be prepared for some obliqueness of approach. In his prefatory chapter Martinazzoli discusses literary originality in antiquity; there is much good sense here, if little that is new. His observations on the tendency of ancient writers to adapt familiar material and *τρόποι* in such a way as to improve upon a predecessor's use of them—'aemulatio' (ζῆλος)

rather than 'imitatio'—owe something to Rostagni and others. Martinazzoli, however, shows a wide knowledge of ancient literature and an up-to-date acquaintance with modern criticism;<sup>1</sup> his book is a pleasing combination of learning and literary sensibility.

Fragments of Sappho reported only in paraphrase are notoriously treacherous ground. It is much to Martinazzoli's credit that he cites the passage of Libanius which alludes to Sappho's use of *νῆξ διπλασία* (fr. 197, Lobel-Page) in its extended context, and can thus argue persuasively that, for the orator's quotation to have point in this New Year address to the Emperor Julian, the phrase in Sappho must have carried the erotic sense of the trope known from Meleager, Propertius, and Ovid (*Am.* i. 13. 45-46) and later found in Seneca and Lucian. The wording in Libanius is rightly stressed: οὐδὲν ἐκάλυπεν and, more particularly, αὐτῇ show that Sappho was referring to herself, and dispose of Schadewaldt's view that a bridal pair was in question. Assuming, as I think one must, that Libanius applied Sappho's words with precision, this demonstration seems sound and would affect some estimates of Sappho. One could perhaps wish that Martinazzoli had stopped at this point; the Attic skolia and other passages he goes on to cite (pp. 67 f.) are only distantly relevant. Certainly Sappho's swallow-fragment (fr. 135 Lobel-Page) may have been associated with this theme, but even if it was, there is no cogent reason for future editors to print it next to fr. 197, as is suggested on p. 77. A motif which, on the author's own showing, is 'antico quanto gli uomini e l'amore' may well have recurred in widely different contexts in Sappho.

Discussion of Virgil, *Aeneid* i. 630, *non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco*, is preceded by a succinct review of the concept of *ὁμοιοπάθεια* in ancient writers, which is traced back through Meleager and Sophocles (*O.C.* 562 f.) to the *Iliad* (xxiv. 486-7). This, though interesting, is not strictly necessary to Martinazzoli's vindication of what is in effect the interpretation of Servius (also in Donatus); this is a self-contained proof based on Virgilian word-usage. The sense is 'non

<sup>1</sup> Yet one misses some rather obvious supporting illustrations. On p. 18 Aeschylus fr. 253 N<sup>2</sup> might have been quoted with its Euripidean analogue (fr. 792 N<sup>2</sup>), while for the general argument of this introductory chapter Bacchyl. 3. 85-87 could well be compared with the relevant passages in Pindar.

disco, tamquam ignara mali, miseris succurrere', and the present tense *disco* which has disconcerted editors is in fact perfectly natural. Martinazzoli has no trouble in showing that if Virgil had intended with his *non ignara* the litotes which his commentators have conspired to foist on him (something like Lawrence Binyon's 'I am not all so ignorant of grief'), then his idiom would have demanded *haud ignara*, as is shown by *Aen.* x. 247 and five other passages. As it is the line has a characteristically Virgilian form, with the negative placed first word and modifying the verb at the line-end, as, for example, *Aen.* iv. 330. A satisfying rehabilitation of a neglected view; it is curious that this does not appear to have been anticipated in any of the standard commentaries, or even by Henry, as likely a Virgilian as any to have sensed the idiom, although he quoted Meleager's οἷδα παθὼν ἄλγεῖν and Aesch. *Suppl.* 214-15 (*Aeneidea* i, p. 792). The only advocate of the Servian interpretation known to me is A. J. Bell, in his *Latin Dual and Poetic Diction* (Oxford, 1923), pp. 358 f. He is compelled by his argument to make the negative do double duty, and so clings to the litotes. The credit for disposing of this is entirely Martinazzoli's.

There appear to be only trivial blemishes, and few of these. The book is fully indexed and pleasingly printed.

JOHN G. GRIFFITH

Jesus College, Oxford

ALBIN LESKY: *Die griechische Tragödie*. Pp. 285; 4 plates. Stuttgart: Kröner, 1958. Cloth, DM. 9.

THIS new edition of Lesky's book on Greek tragedy in Kröner's Taschenausgabe is expanded by about one fifth from the edition of 1937 (*C.R.* lii. 219). The Aeschylus chapter is partly rewritten to take account of the new arguments to the *Danaid* trilogy and to the *Aetna*, and the fragments of the *Diktyuloi*. The amount of quotation from the plays has been increased throughout and some paragraphs added, but the main novelty is a new chapter of thirty-six pages on *Das Tragische*.

{With a view to finding a place for Greek tragedy within a general theory of tragedy in the modern sense of the word Lesky distinguishes three categories, the *geschlossene tragische Weltschicht*, a closed tragic conception of life in general, the *geschlossene tragische Konflikt*, which is Goethe's 'irreconcilable conflict', and the *tragische Situation*, which does not preclude a happy ending and

thus allows for that common type of Greek tragedy. It is not however claimed that this covers the *Helen*. Nor in Greek tragedy is there a clear instance of the first category. Aristotle's theory of *catharsis* is not regarded as a generally acceptable explanation of the moral effects of tragedy. The answer to the question whether the tragic poet is consciously a teacher is that usually he is not, though the effect of his work is in fact morally improving.

I note a few other modifications. The later date for the *Supplices* is, of course, accepted without hesitation. But this being so it is not obvious that a third actor could not have been available for the *Danaides*, and the possibility of a formal trial scene with *Hypermnestra*, *Danaus*, and *Aphrodite* cannot be ruled out. The rejection of the *ekkyklema* is less sweeping than in the first edition, but *Heracles* in the *H.F.*, the play in which, if any, the *ekkyklema* is indispensable, is described as visible through an open door. A new warning is given against the introduction of too much psychology into the interpretation of the *Alkestis*. The possibility that the iambic prologue to the *I.A.* may not be by Euripides is taken a shade more seriously. A date in the late fourth or in the third century for the *Gyges* play is stated to be beyond question.

A completely revised bibliography adds the finishing touch to the revision of this valuable little book which for its size is astonishingly rich in content.

King's College, Cambridge

D. W. LUCAS

DUDLEY FITTS: *The Birds* of Aristophanes. An English version. Pp. 140. London: Faber, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.

FITTS's *Birds* is a definite improvement on his *Lysistrata*, mainly because he is far more sensitive now to the changes of style and feeling in the original: he succeeds in catching something of the sublimity of the parabasis, and the para-tragedy of the Iris scene comes off admirably. This is a major step forward.

He claims, reasonably, in the preface 'a certain licence in rendering the choral passages', but in practice avails himself so freely of this licence that much of the lyrics is omitted or altered, and one often feels that more fidelity to the letter would have helped, not hindered, fidelity to the spirit of the original. Moreover, the extremely free verse used in the invocation-scene (and elsewhere) makes no pretence of reproducing

Aristophanes' subtle changes of metre. (An odd contrast to this procedure is provided by the occasional use of classical metres in unexpected places, like the Sapphics used for the odes of the second parabasis.) Some phrases, e.g. 'ambrosial finality of song' and 'liquid instancy of song' (at the end of the ode and antode of the first parabasis), will not be everyone's idea of poetry. The dialogue, too, is often translated rather freely: there are omissions (e.g. Heracles' speech in 1692) and unnecessary departures from the original (e.g. 24-25, 1227-8) and a few nasty mistakes, e.g. 516 *θεράπων* 'medical man', 694 *ἀπείροσι* 'untried', 806 *σκάφιον ἀποτετιμμένον* 'tensured in the dark'.

Fitts has arrived independently at Merry's suggestion that the second halves of 840 and 842 should be attributed to Euelpides. This is certainly not impossible, but Fitts's statement 'Incorporated in Pisthetairos' speech they have no comic force at all' represents a minority view. In addition, 1628 is attributed to Peisetairos, which seems impossible, and Heracles' words are mistranslated 'Speak, you divine Mistake'. 265-6 are continued to Euelpides in the text, though a note explicitly attributes them to 'Pisthetairos'. Incidentally, 'Peisetairos' is probably the better form of the name, as Dobree said, *Adv.* ii. 213.

There are notes on particular passages and an index of proper names, which will be helpful to the Greekless reader, though it contains some gaps and inaccuracies (e.g. 'Pharnakes: a Persian nobleman operating as an enemy agent in Athens.'). The preface oddly describes the play as having been written 'during those tense months after the sailing of the Sicilian Expedition, when the disheartening war must have seemed endless in prospect and even victory a sick delusion'. In the text, Fitts gives the number of choreutai as 26 and still misleadingly uses 'Choragos' of the chorus-leader in Attic drama, though *χορηγός* is defined correctly on p. 129.

The play is correctly subdivided according to the structure of Old Comedy, though the agon should begin at 451.

Exeter College, Oxford

D. MERVYN JONES

MARIA RICO GOMEZ: Platon, *Criton*. Edición, traducción y notas, con estudio preliminar. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. xvi+21 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1957. Paper, 25 ptas.

LUIS GIL FERNANDEZ: Platon, *Fedro*.

Edición bilingüe, traducción, notas y estudio preliminar. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. lxxiii+83 (double). Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1957. Paper, 150 ptas.

ANTONIO RUIZ DE ELVIRA: Platon, *Menon*. Edición bilingüe. (Clásicos Políticos.) Pp. lvii+68 (double); one folding plate. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Políticos, 1958. Paper, 200 ptas.

THIS attractively printed series gives a facing translation with occasional notes at the foot of the page, and is clearly modelled on the Budé series. Fourteen titles have already been published and more are announced. They are all historical, political, or philosophical texts but the range is wide. The *Crito* is on a rather smaller scale than the other two here noticed. The text appears to be that of Burnet and the *apparatus criticus* is abbreviated from his, except for three additions from the Budé *apparatus*. The brief introduction avoids controversial questions, but it may be noted that Socrates is treated very much as the defender of tradition against the destructive activities of the sophists, and this is supported by the translation of *τὰ νόμιμα* as 'tradición' rather than as 'legalidad'. But it is surely the second in the first instance that Socrates is concerned to defend in the *Crito*. Neither in this dialogue nor in the other two am I competent to pronounce on the quality of the Spanish translation and I must leave this for others to judge.

The editor of the *Phaedrus* presents his own text, taking into account suggestions made in recent years. The *apparatus criticus* is confined to cases where modern editors disagree about the text. In 249 b he conjectures *κα(τὰ τὸ) εἶδος* in addition to the *ἰόν(τ')* made by others. This is no better and no worse than most other suggestions here, though the earlier *(τὸ) κατ' εἶδος* with a different meaning is a simpler correction. In 266 a (*τὰ μὲν*) *σκαιά* makes the text regular but should fail beside *Politicus* 291 e 5, cited by W. H. Thompson in his note. In 275 c *οἰόμενος (οἴους τ')* *εἶναι* is a good emendation and is an improvement on all before. In the same sentence *ἢ τὸν* for *τοῦ τὸν* is possible but may not be necessary. The introduction is excellent and is up to the standard of the best of the Budé series. It covers all major matters of scholarship but does not give much about the relation of *διαίρεσις* to Plato's later view of dialectic.

The editor of the *Meno* follows similar lines. The text in this case is extremely conservative, and no emendations of any kind are accepted into the printed page. The editor has partly re-collated Y (Vindobonensis 21) which was carelessly used by Croiset. He regards it as of more importance for the text than has previously been recognized, and he includes also in his *apparatus criticus* the evidence for the Greek provided by Aristippus' Latin translation. The introduction deals fully with the textual tradition and includes an appraisal of Jachmann's theories, which are not accepted. A study of successive editions of Ficinus' Latin translation reveals the need to consult those before the revision by Grynaeus in 1546 in order to appreciate Ficinus' scholarship and accuracy as a translator. There is a good discussion of the dramatic date of the dialogue, making use of J. S. Morrison's reconstruction in *C.Q.* xxxvi (1942). Philosophical questions are not ignored though they receive less attention on the whole than points of scholarship.

In conclusion it may be said that both the edition of the *Phaedrus* and that of the *Meno* form very acceptable contributions to Platonic studies and should be consulted by anyone who has a serious interest in the study of these dialogues.

University College, Swansea G. B. KERFERD

Aristotelis *Politica* recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit W. D. ROSS, (*Scriptorum Classicorum Bibliotheca Oxoniensis*.) Pp. x+282. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Cloth, 25s. net.

SIR DAVID ROSS now gives readers of the *Politics* the benefit of his immense and exact knowledge of Aristotelian thought and usage. The apparatus of the new edition is in the main a revision of that of Immisch and the debt to him is acknowledged in the Preface. There are, however, considerable rearrangements made in the interests of clarity; some details are omitted, and some more recent conjectures are added. The value of the edition lies not in any fresh material collected but in the actual choice of readings and in the editor's own numerous conjectures. No new study of the manuscripts seems to have been made, except in one particular: in order to obtain an idea of the relative value of the two families *II*<sup>1</sup> and *II*<sup>2</sup>, Ross has compared them where possible with the fragmentary tenth-century Vaticanus 1298, the most ancient of the manuscripts and of

proved excellence. The result of this experiment is that *II*<sup>2</sup> comes out better, and Ross concludes that its readings should be preferred in places where there is no more substantial reason to the contrary. The argument seems sound, and the resulting rule is applied with caution. Of the new conjectures, I will only say that it is surprising to see how many small things were still to be done which appear obvious now that Ross's hand has touched them. The index is in general on the same lines as that of Immisch, but contains in addition useful articles on key-words (e.g. πόλις, πολιτεία, δημοκρατία) which will be very valuable. A few accents are wrong; but the printing and production are of the highest standard.

St. John's College, Oxford D. A. RUSSELL

LEA S. DE SCAZZOCCHIO: *Poética y Crítica Literaria en Plutarco*. Pp. 93. Montevideo: Universidad de la República, Facultad de Humanidades, 1957. Paper.

THIS work comprises an essay on Plutarch's literary views, together with a Spanish translation of *Quomodo adolescens poetas audire debeat*. The author has not, it would appear, had access either to the 'new' Teubner texts of the *Moralia* or to much modern literature. (Not even Ziegler's article in *R.E.* has been used.) The introductory essay gives some account of the aesthetic theories of Plato and Aristotle, and then proceeds to Plutarch. Most of the relevant texts are discussed, but the writer does not seem sufficiently aware that this is a subject in which Plutarch is mainly valuable for what he preserves of earlier theory, his own interest not being very deeply engaged. But there are a number of suggestions and discussions of value, in particular some interesting comparisons with *De sublimitate* in connexion with *φαντασία*. The translation possesses a few notes, based on the Loeb edition and Wyttienbach, which seem accurate and clear. Of its literary merits, I cannot judge.

St. John's College, Oxford D. A. RUSSELL

Arrian, *The Life of Alexander the Great*. Translated by AUBREY DE SELINCOURT. Pp. xvii+256; maps. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1958. Paper, 3s. 6d. net.

THIS is a welcome addition to the series of Penguin Classics. The general public now



has an easily obtainable version of the main source for the life of Alexander which can be read with pleasure in a train or on a steamer by anyone with a taste for history, and the student has a guide to the Greek that will give the sense clearly. Naturally the English does not everywhere follow the structure of the Greek sentences with the exactitude of a crib, but it is no disadvantage to find always something that can be read and not merely studied. Occasionally the colloquial manner goes a little too far: I feel that at vii. 5. 3 *συμβόλαιον* is rather too formal a term to be rendered by 'an I.O.U.', even though the debts are those of serving soldiers. Arrian is well suited to be rendered into modern English without loss of character, and this has certainly been done by Mr. de Selincourt.

In the introduction the translator has a difficult task in treating so large a subject in so little space. But behind Arrian himself, Plutarch, Diodorus, and Curtius, the lost primary authorities, Aristobulus and Ptolemy, Onesicritus and Callisthenes, receive due mention; and Arrian's limitations are made clear. Would it not also have been of value and interest to the general reader just to mention the vague mass of lore collected and used by Pseudo-Callisthenes in the Alexander Romance, which spread in various versions between Ireland and Malaya and testifies to the indelible impression left by Alexander on the popular mind? During the centuries before Greek learning returned to western Europe, the ancestors of the Penguin public, learned or lay, took their notion of Alexander mainly from the Romance.

The introduction ends with a note on military terminology. In giving the various senses of the word *ἐταῖροι* that are found in Arrian, it might have been an advantage to show a little more of the historical reasons for this variety. But Mr. de Selincourt is primarily concerned to justify his use of words in the translation, which is satisfactory since he keeps Hetaeri for the picked troops of the household brigade. He is probably right not to reproduce 'phalanx' very often in English, since to the general reader this does, as he says, suggest a solid massed formation, and it will not readily be remembered that in Arrian it means all Alexander's own heavy infantry, however deployed.

The translator and his publisher are to be congratulated on making a minor author available in this series for the sake of his tremendous subject.

E. D. PHILLIPS

The Queen's University of Belfast

4598.3

VINCENZ BUCHHEIT: *Studien zu Methodios von Olympos*. (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, Band 69.) Pp. xvi+181. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1958. Paper, DM. 22.50.

A RE-EXAMINATION of Methodius's thought and writings is long overdue, and the present monograph merits a good reception. It is a competent volume of prolegomena, intended to prepare the ground for a fresh edition of the text. Bonwetsch's standard edition of 1917 in the Berlin Corpus is well known to be deficient, especially since Heseler's demonstration that in the *Symposium* only two of his manuscripts (OP) possess any independent authority. Buchheit's study takes the story farther by a detailed scrutiny of Methodius's syntax and style, on the ground of which it is possible to speak with far more confidence of what this very mannered writer is likely to have written in any given instance. It is recognized that Methodius's style is not uniform or consistent. Naturally the *Symposium* is full of Platonic allusions and is more classical than his other works. In *De Resurrectione* popular usages are freely admitted (especially the substantival infinitive and prepositional forms), so that here Methodius produces an odd mixture of contemporary and classical styles. He is evidently a well-educated man and knows his Homer fairly intimately. Towards rhetoric his attitude is ambivalent. On the one hand, he regards the devil as a 'sophist' (*Symp.* vii. 5; cf. viii. 1) and echoes the *Gorgias* on those whose profession it is to persuade rather than to discover the truth (*de Res.* i. 27-28). On the other hand, when it is put to so laudable a purpose as the praise of chastity, rhetoric is acknowledged as a gift of God (*Symp.* viii. 17); and Thecla is awarded the largest crown because her panegyric has been the best (xi). Buchheit plausibly suggests that in this positive evaluation of the art of rhetoric Methodius owes much to Clement of Alexandria.

In an important section Buchheit uses the results of his stylistic inquiry to provide criteria for judging the authenticity of six disputed pieces. He concludes in favour of Thecla's hymn at the end of the *Symposium* and of the extracts from *De Creatis* preserved by Photius, but against the genuineness of the remaining four, namely, the antichiliastic fragment first printed from Vatican fr. 2022 by Pitra (in Bonwetsch, p. 423), the two discourses, *De Symeone et Anna* and *In ramos palmarum*, disregarded by Bonwetsch but printed in Migne, P.G. xviii. 347-98,

U



and the five fragments which Bonwetsch accepts as authentic extracts from *Adversus Porphyrium*. Only the judgement on this last item is likely to require the revision of accepted notions. The first three fragments are preserved among a collection of Ascetica, containing many dubious items, in Monac. gr. 498, s. X, where they are not ascribed to a work bearing the title 'Against Porphyry'. The last two, together with a sentence in the third, are cited in the *Sacra Parallela* as coming from this lost work. This is a flimsy basis for so bold an ascription. I have no doubt whatever that Buchheit is correct in denying the authenticity of these pieces. The third fragment reads like a piece of Apollinarius (which, as he was also author of a work against Porphyry, perhaps it is) or Cyril of Alexandria. In the Munich manuscript it is immediately followed by a piece of Cyril.

H. CHADWICK

Christ Church, Oxford

FRIEDHELM LEFHERZ: *Studien zu Gregor von Nazianz: Mythologie, Überlieferung, Scholiasten*. (Inaugural Dissertation, Bonn.) Pp. 311. Bonn, 1958. Obtainable from the author at Düsseldorf-Wersten, Richratherstr. 9. Stiff paper, DM. 4.50.

THE most interesting section of this doctoral dissertation on Gregory Nazianzen is the first, where the author provides a brief commentary on six obscure allusions to Greek mythology. The second part surveys the printed editions of Gregory's works, while the third consists of a useful catalogue of the numerous Byzantine scholiasts. The bibliographical information is valuable.

Christ Church, Oxford

H. CHADWICK

VICTOR MARTIN: *Papyrus Bodmer II: Supplément. Évangile de Jean chap. 14-21*. Pp. 53. Cologny, Geneva: Bibliotheca Bodmeriana, 1958. Paper.

IN 1956 appeared an edition by Professor Martin of an important papyrus codex in Baron Bodmer's library which contained chapters i-xiv. 15 of St. John's Gospel. A slip of paper inserted in the cover informed readers that the Bodmer library had just acquired a number of small fragments from the same codex containing portions of the

later chapters. Since the identification and decipherment of these were likely to be a somewhat lengthy task, it was decided not to delay the publication of the main portion but to issue the new fragments in a later supplement. The present volume is the fulfilment of that task and will be welcomed by biblical scholars. The papyrus is of comparatively early date, all the scholars consulted by the editor having placed it independently at about the year 200, and thus a century or more earlier than B and X. The scribe was a little careless, but a corrector has repaired many of his errors, and the final text is on the whole a good one, showing an early stage of development and often agreeing with that indicated by quotations in the Fathers. It has, however, a number of individual readings, some no doubt mere errors but others deserving of serious attention. It shows, remarks the editor, a certain tendency to concentration, one mark of early date. In xv. 4, for example, it has οὕτως καὶ ὁ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένων for οὕτως οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς ἐὰν μὴ ἐν ἐμοὶ μένητε. In xv. 8 πλιονα [sic] is a notable variant for πολύν, and in xviii. 2 Ἰουδας was probably omitted. In xix. 3 the papyrus has βασιλεὺς for ὁ βασιλεὺς, and in the next verse αἰτιαῖν οὐχ ευρισκῶ for οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν εὐρίσκω.

There are some apparent misprints. P. 24, verse 22, αὐτοῖς should be αὐτοῖς. P. 34, xix. 2, the text as printed has στε[φ]ανος for στέφανον: is this a variant not noted in the annotations or a misprint? P. 36, line 3, του[του] is misprinted for του[του], and on p. 39, first line, the point after εβ[αλο], which comes between the verb and its object and is not mentioned in the apparatus, is presumably another misprint.

H. I. BELL

ERIC G. JAY: *New Testament Greek. An Introductory Grammar*. Pp. viii + 350. London: S.P.C.K., 1958. Boards, 21s. net.

THERE are thousands of ordinands and dozens of other students being trained to teach Religious Knowledge in England today; the great majority are expected to be capable of reading the New Testament in its original Greek before they achieve their final qualifications. In the days before the Second World War it used to be assumed that a large number of people in this position would have learned Greek at school already, and would therefore find the Greek of the New Testament easy to read. They might find 2 Corinthians and Hebrews rather

complicated; they would be horrified by Mark's slovenly use of Greek and scandalized by the distressing liberties which the author of Revelation takes with accident and syntax; but they would find no serious difficulty in translating the text.

Today no such assumption can safely be made. Only a very small minority of ordinands and would-be-teachers have learned any Greek at school. What is more serious, many students of the New Testament have never seriously studied *English* grammar. It is the experience of many who have struggled with the essays of theological students to find that a reference to a relative clause causes nothing but a blank expression on the student's face and that the same fate attends a mention of an unattached participle. Grammars of New Testament Greek, therefore, must today try to teach not only New Testament Greek grammar but also simultaneously *English* grammar.

Both needs are magnificently met in Dr. Jay's book. There are in fact very few rivals to this work in the field. J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek* in two volumes, though a classic, is too large and too complex to be of much use to the average ordinand. C. F. D. Moule's *Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek* is of no use as a practical grammar and yet cannot either be regarded as an exhaustive work on its subject. H. P. V. Nunn's *Elements of New Testament Greek*, which at the moment almost holds the field alone, is a slighter work than Dr. Jay's. The others are books of the 'Teach yourself New Testament Greek' variety. Dr. Jay has produced a full, but not overloaded, very competently written volume, handsomely produced by the S.P.C.K. at a price which should not deter the student who really wants to learn the language of the New Testament instead of merely scrambling through his examinations somehow. There are thirty chapters with plenty of exercises, both Greek-English and English-Greek, attached to each, appendixes full of useful paradigms and lists, and a Greek-English Vocabulary and a Greek Index well calculated to help the student but not to emancipate him from hard work. And at every stage the corresponding part of English grammar is explained before the Greek is approached. Particularly good points are the author's explanation of prepositions (pp. 30-31), his account of the use of the Middle Voice (p. 84), his analysis of the Attracted Relative (p. 172), his list of Semitisms (pp. 265; though he might have warned the student at some point that the Greek of the Revelation is entirely *sui generis*), and his list of words

differing in accents (pp. 278-9; he might, however, have added to *εἰς* and *ἐς* the form *εἰς*).

It is deplorable to find the old pronunciation of Greek perpetrated on pp. 4 and 5; it is about time that the barbarous Teutonic diphthongs disappeared from our pronunciation of Greek, classical or *koine*. And it might have saved Dr. Jay space, time, and trouble had he confined himself to throwing all the irregular verbs (or is the word 'irregular' non-U among modern grammarians?) into a single table, instead of classifying them carefully and distributing them among several chapters. Is anything gained, for instance, by defining *φέρω* as a verb with a liquid stem, since it so wantonly deserts that stem? A few other causes of complaint can be detected. It is not quite accurate for *koine* to say that 'a neuter plural subject has a singular verb' (p. 32); *οἱ κακῶς ἔχοντες* is a far from self-explanatory phrase to take as an illustration of an adjectival participle (p. 164); and the list of compounds of *εἶμι* in the New Testament should include *ἔξιμι* (p. 264). The keener eye can observe a few misprints: consonant for consonant (p. 6), *κάταβα* for *κατάβα* (p. 97), *ἡμελλον* for *ἡμελλον* (p. 135), 'i' for 'is' (p. 162), and the omission of a closing bracket (p. 253). But Dr. Jay would not be human if he did not allow a few faults to appear in a work so laborious, so useful, and so deserving of admiration.

University of Nottingham R. P. C. HANSON

CHARLES SELTMAN. *Riot in Ephesus. Writings on the Heritage of Greece*. Pp. 172. London: Parrish, 1958. Cloth, 21s. net.

THE lamented author wrote a number of popular articles, many of which appeared in *History Today*. Mr. Quennell has selected eleven of these, which now appear in book form. They obviously were thrown off from time to time without any deep study, and of course, as they are popular in tone, without the apparatus which would accompany more serious works. It would have been well to have had them looked over by some competent scholar, as this would have got rid of some little slips *quos aut incuria fudit*. . . . Thus, the statement about the Delphic *omphalos* on p. 50 has been out of date since 1951, p. 72 has the popular misspelling Caius for Gaius, and p. 113, slightly misquoting Ammianus Marcellinus, astonishingly makes

him a poet. But apart from such trifles, the little works were worth putting out in more permanent form than the pages of a magazine. The subjects are, besides the essay which gives the book its title, 'A Mine of Statues', 'Peisistratus of Athens', 'The Two Gods of Delphi', 'Sacred and Profane Love in Ancient Greece', 'The Ruler-Cult—from Alexander of Macedon to Elizabeth I of England', 'Pythagoras: Artist, Statesman and Philosopher', 'Diogenes: the Original Cynic', 'Epicurus and the Pursuit of Happiness', 'The Wine Trade in Ancient Greece', and 'Atalanta'. Clearly, it is a mixed bag, and every one is worth reading, whether or not the reader agrees with the author's emphatic and personal views. There is also a 'Foreword' by Mr. Quennell.

The mine of statues is Herculaneum and Pompeii, and a very lively account is given of the persons under whose charge the excavations began, emphasis being laid on the merits of Weber the engineer, the only one who had any notion of how an excavation should be carried out. The essay on Peisistratos (pp. 25-47) does that great man the credit which he deserves, but I doubt if the ceremonial described by Plutarch (*Solon* 9) is really a commemoration of his exploit in the capture of Salamis; so many δράματα are connected with real or alleged historical events in ancient tradition that all such *aitia* need careful criticism. I have elsewhere (*C.Q.* xxxiv. 81) suggested that the story of Phye and her acting the part of Athena is a rationalization of a genuine belief that the goddess brought Peisistratos home; Seltman accepts it without question. The essay on Delphi is provocatively ingenious. Seltman supposes, not without reason, that the Pythia was something like a modern 'medium' and some of her revelations were genuine telepathy or the like; but on pp. 50-51 he attributes her increased sensitivity to very mild cyanide poisoning from the bay-leaves she chewed. A physiologist informs me that the result would be rather to make her stupid and dumpish, not in the least sensitive. The whole description of her procedure should be compared with the sober account in Parke-Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* i, chap. iii. The riot in Ephesus is of course that described in Acts xix. 23 ff., and is coloured by the author's dislike of St. Paul's views on women and a marked sympathy for Artemis and her priestesses. Feminism again colours the very interesting study of sacred and profane love, and has its place in the brief but good account of the apotheosis of ancient rulers and the reappearance of something like it among the subjects of

Elizabeth Tudor. The account of Pythagoras extracts a large amount of at least plausible detail from the scanty and corrupt tradition, and that of Diogenes is certainly not far wrong when it sums him up (p. 143) as a 'crazed old man'. Epicurus is handled sympathetically, the wine-trade illustrated among other things by evidence from coin-types, and Atalanta used to support a thesis that Greek women, even in Athens, were not so entirely home-keeping and unathletic as is popularly supposed.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

A. KURFESS: *Appendix Sallustiana*. Fasc. 2: *Invectivae*. Editio tertia emendata et aucta. Pp. x+30. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958. Paper, DM. 3.

THE first Teubner edition of the *Invectivae* by Kurfess appeared in 1914, the second in 1950, and this, the third (and the first to be reviewed in *C.R.*), in 1958. The final result is a strangely untidy little book, of more importance for Sallust studies and bibliography than for any new light it throws on the text. It includes prefaces to the second and third editions, but the preface to the first edition, which described the manuscripts, has for no apparent reason been suppressed, leaving nothing behind but a rump of *sigla*. The second edition accepted seven new readings in the text. It preferred *rei publicae* (*Inv. in Cic.* 1. 1) to *rem publicam*, but in the third the original reading has been restored without comment in the process of repointing the sentence beginning *ubi*. The only change of substance is *insequeris* (the reading of a single manuscript) for *sequeris* (*Inv. in Cic.* 4. 7), which certainly makes better sense. The third edition introduces four more small changes in the text, and takes cognizance of the Metz manuscript investigated by R. Michelly (*Bursian* 269 [1940], 52-55) to the extent of printing selected readings in the preface.

The fact is allowed to emerge from the preface to the second edition that Kurfess has returned to his earlier view (of the time of the first edition) that the *Inv. in Cic.* is non-Sallustian. W. Farber, who thought otherwise and whom Kurfess supported for a while with his studies of the *clausulae*, is dismissed with obscure praise, and the reader's attention is enthusiastically directed to the views of O. Seel (*Klio*, Beih. xlvii, 1943): in earnest of this conversion, Seel's list of

non-Sallustian words in the *Inv. in Cic.* is printed at the end of the volume.

The third edition has been augmented by an appendix containing the parallel passages from Dio xlvii. 1-28 previously omitted because they were too bulky to go into the apparatus. The preface contains a suggestion, based on affinities with the vocabulary of the Younger Pliny, that the *Inv. in Sall.* is of the age of Trajan, and concludes with a summary of Hejnic's theory (*Rhein. Mus.* xcix [1956], 255-77) that Clodius wrote the *Inv. in Cic.* in 53, and that Sallust delivered it in 52—a view which Kurfess briefly dismisses as *sagacior quam verior*. There is a useful bibliography of works published during 1950-6.

For such a small work there are many mistakes. Most of these are the result of neglecting to renumber references after the insertion of the Dio parallels and the preface to the third edition. The general air of haphazard assembly is complete when we discover that, while all the other indexes refer by chapter and paragraph, Seel's index of non-Sallustian words refers by page and line.

D. A. MALCOLM

University of Glasgow

N. MARINONE: *Cicerone, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. Pp. xxviii + 330. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 800.

This is an annotated edition of selections from *De Finibus* in the series 'I Classici della Nuova Italia' for Italian schools. The text is that of Schiche, with alterations in punctuation only. The notes are based on a previously published annotated translation by the editor. The selection is a generous one comprising about three-fifths of the original, and it has been made with good judgement. There are useful headings and summaries at the beginnings of each section, and an adequate introduction.

It is interesting to compare the annotation with that in English school editions. A great deal of the text is translated in the notes, and the grammatical commentary is elementary. The aim is presumably to facilitate rapid reading, but an English teacher would feel that those advanced enough to read *De Finibus* at all would be able to get on with a good deal less assistance.

University College, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

Saint Jérôme: *Lettres*; Texte établi et traduit par J. LABOURT. Tome vi. Pp. 169 (163 double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper.

THE latest volume of the Budé Letters of Jerome comprises *Ep.* 110-20 (three of which are letters of Augustine to Jerome). The general character of this edition has been indicated in reviews of earlier volumes (*C.R.* lxiv [1950], 58-59, lxvii [1953], 204, lxix [1955], 111-12, 322-3). Here, as before, we have a sound text, substantially that of Hilberg, a clear and careful translation with occasional surprising lapses, and an inadequate and misleading critical apparatus.

To take the last point first: in several places Canon Labourt discusses the text in his notes to the French translation without indicating what the manuscripts actually read (e.g. pp. 13, 35, 87); he misquotes Hilberg's apparatus (e.g. p. 87, l. 24, where his note implies that *WΦ* read *cito*, which they do not; p. 88, l. 27, where he—or can it be his printer?—wrongly attributes to the manuscript tradition the reading *fugiens urso*); he refers critical notes to the wrong lines of his text (e.g. p. 91, l. 5, where the note properly refers to line 2, though without consulting Hilberg one cannot tell; p. 93, l. 31, where the note refers to line 29; p. 120, l. 21, where the note refers to line 11 and mentions brackets—*uncis inclusam . . . edimus*—which are not in Labourt's text, though they are in Hilberg's).

Examples of mistranslation are: p. 21, l. 20, *quid igitur ego stultus . . . qui id pollicear, quod ille non potuit* is rendered 'suis-je ce fou . . . qui a promis ce qu'il n'a pu tenir', whereas grammar and context demand that *ille* should refer not to the *stultus* but to Marius Victorinus; p. 23, l. 16, *legisse* (the text actually has the meaningless misprint *legis*) is rendered as if it meant 'read', but it must mean 'chosen'; p. 49, l. 4, *quod a vero non abhorreat persuadere* is rendered 'me persuader que leur sentiment n'est pas incompatible avec la vérité' whereas it means 'convince me of something not inconsistent with known truths'; p. 113, ll. 23 ff., where uncertainty about the beginning of the main clause has led to a muddled translation.

Proof-reading seems to have been hasty. P. 11, l. 16, has a false reference to Cicero's *Laelius*, though the correct one stands on the opposite page. P. 45, note 1, speaks of Cicero's *De optimo genere interpretandi* (= *De opt. gen. oratorum*). P. 63, note 1, implies that Labourt is translating *praedicare*, while his text has *praedicari*. P. 90, l. 13, a hopelessly garbled critical note. P. 168, for *felonem* read

him a poet. But apart from such trifles, the little works were worth putting out in more permanent form than the pages of a magazine. The subjects are, besides the essay which gives the book its title, 'A Mine of Statues', 'Peisistratos of Athens', 'The Two Gods of Delphi', 'Sacred and Profane Love in Ancient Greece', 'The Ruler-Cult—from Alexander of Macedon to Elizabeth I of England', 'Pythagoras: Artist, Statesman and Philosopher', 'Diogenes: the Original Cynic', 'Epicurus and the Pursuit of Happiness', 'The Wine Trade in Ancient Greece', and 'Atalanta'. Clearly, it is a mixed bag, and every one is worth reading, whether or not the reader agrees with the author's emphatic and personal views. There is also a 'Foreword' by Mr. Quennell.

The mine of statues is Herculaneum and Pompeii, and a very lively account is given of the persons under whose charge the excavations began, emphasis being laid on the merits of Weber the engineer, the only one who had any notion of how an excavation should be carried out. The essay on Peisistratos (pp. 25-47) does that great man the credit which he deserves, but I doubt if the ceremonial described by Plutarch (*Solon* 9) is really a commemoration of his exploit in the capture of Salamis; so many *δράματα* are connected with real or alleged historical events in ancient tradition that all such *aitia* need careful criticism. I have elsewhere (*C.Q.* xxxiv. 81) suggested that the story of Phye and her acting the part of Athena is a rationalization of a genuine belief that the goddess brought Peisistratos home; Seltman accepts it without question. The essay on Delphi is provocatively ingenious. Seltman supposes, not without reason, that the Pythia was something like a modern 'medium' and some of her revelations were genuine telepathy or the like; but on pp. 50-51 he attributes her increased sensitivity to very mild cyanide poisoning from the bay-leaves she chewed. A physiologist informs me that the result would be rather to make her stupid and dumpy, not in the least sensitive. The whole description of her procedure should be compared with the sober account in Parke-Wormell, *Delphic Oracle* i, chap. iii. The riot in Ephesus is of course that described in Acts xix. 23 ff., and is coloured by the author's dislike of St. Paul's views on women and a marked sympathy for Artemis and her priestesses. Feminism again colours the very interesting study of sacred and profane love, and has its place in the brief but good account of the apotheosis of ancient rulers and the reappearance of something like it among the subjects of

Elizabeth Tudor. The account of Pythagoras extracts a large amount of at least plausible detail from the scanty and corrupt tradition, and that of Diogenes is certainly not far wrong when it sums him up (p. 143) as a 'crazed old man'. Epicurus is handled sympathetically, the wine-trade illustrated among other things by evidence from coin-types, and Atalanta used to support a thesis that Greek women, even in Athens, were not so entirely home-keeping and unathletic as is popularly supposed.

St. Andrews

H. J. ROSE

A. KURFESS: *Appendix Sallustiana*. Fasc. 2: *Invectivae*. Editio tertia emendata et aucta. Pp. x+30. Leipzig: Teubner, 1958. Paper, DM. 3.

THE first Teubner edition of the *Invectivae* by Kurfess appeared in 1914, the second in 1950, and this, the third (and the first to be reviewed in *C.R.*), in 1958. The final result is a strangely untidy little book, of more importance for Sallust studies and bibliography than for any new light it throws on the text. It includes prefaces to the second and third editions, but the preface to the first edition, which described the manuscripts, has for no apparent reason been suppressed, leaving nothing behind but a rump of *sigla*. The second edition accepted seven new readings in the text. It preferred *rei publicae* (*Inv. in Cic.* 1. 1) to *rem publicam*, but in the third the original reading has been restored without comment in the process of repointing the sentence beginning *ubiubi*. The only change of substance is *insequeris* (the reading of a single manuscript) for *sequeris* (*Inv. in Cic.* 4. 7), which certainly makes better sense. The third edition introduces four more small changes in the text, and takes cognizance of the Metz manuscript investigated by R. Michelly (Bursian 269 [1940], 52-55) to the extent of printing selected readings in the preface.

The fact is allowed to emerge from the preface to the second edition that Kurfess has returned to his earlier view (of the time of the first edition) that the *Inv. in Cic.* is non-Sallustian. W. Farber, who thought otherwise and whom Kurfess supported for a while with his studies of the *clausulae*, is dismissed with obscure praise, and the reader's attention is enthusiastically directed to the views of O. Seel (*Klio*, Beih. xlvii, 1943): in earnest of this conversion, Seel's list of



non-Sallustian words in the *Inv. in Cic.* is printed at the end of the volume.

The third edition has been augmented by an appendix containing the parallel passages from Dio xlv. 1-28 previously omitted because they were too bulky to go into the apparatus. The preface contains a suggestion, based on affinities with the vocabulary of the Younger Pliny, that the *Inv. in Sall.* is of the age of Trajan, and concludes with a summary of Hejnic's theory (*Rhein. Mus.* xcix [1956], 255-77) that Clodius wrote the *Inv. in Cic.* in 53, and that Sallust delivered it in 52—a view which Kurfess briefly dismisses as *sagacior quam verior*. There is a useful bibliography of works published during 1950-6.

For such a small work there are many mistakes. Most of these are the result of neglecting to renumber references after the insertion of the Dio parallels and the preface to the third edition. The general air of haphazard assembly is complete when we discover that, while all the other indexes refer by chapter and paragraph, Seel's index of non-Sallustian words refers by page and line.

D. A. MALCOLM

University of Glasgow

N. MARINONE: *Cicerone, De Finibus Bonorum et Malorum*. Pp. xxviii + 330. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1958. Paper, L. 800.

THIS is an annotated edition of selections from *De Finibus* in the series 'I Classici della Nuova Italia' for Italian schools. The text is that of Schiche, with alterations in punctuation only. The notes are based on a previously published annotated translation by the editor. The selection is a generous one comprising about three-fifths of the original, and it has been made with good judgement. There are useful headings and summaries at the beginnings of each section, and an adequate introduction.

It is interesting to compare the annotation with that in English school editions. A great deal of the text is translated in the notes, and the grammatical commentary is elementary. The aim is presumably to facilitate rapid reading, but an English teacher would feel that those advanced enough to read *De Finibus* at all would be able to get on with a good deal less assistance.

University College, Bangor

M. L. CLARKE

Saint Jérôme: *Lettres*; Texte établi et traduit par J. LABOURT. Tome vi. Pp. 169 (163 double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1958. Paper.

THE latest volume of the Budé Letters of Jerome comprises *Ep.* 110-20 (three of which are letters of Augustine to Jerome). The general character of this edition has been indicated in reviews of earlier volumes (*C.R.* lxiv [1950], 58-59, lxvii [1953], 204, lxix [1955], 111-12, 322-3). Here, as before, we have a sound text, substantially that of Hilberg, a clear and careful translation with occasional surprising lapses, and an inadequate and misleading critical apparatus.

To take the last point first: in several places Canon Labourt discusses the text in his notes to the French translation without indicating what the manuscripts actually read (e.g. pp. 13, 35, 87); he misquotes Hilberg's apparatus (e.g. p. 87, l. 24, where his note implies that *WΦ* read *cito*, which they do not; p. 88, l. 27, where he—or can it be his printer?—wrongly attributes to the manuscript tradition the reading *fugiens urso*); he refers critical notes to the wrong lines of his text (e.g. p. 91, l. 5, where the note properly refers to line 2, though without consulting Hilberg one cannot tell; p. 93, l. 31, where the note refers to line 29; p. 120, l. 21, where the note refers to line 11 and mentions brackets—*uncis inclusam . . . edimus*—which are not in Labourt's text, though they are in Hilberg's).

Examples of mistranslation are: p. 21, l. 20, *quid igitur ego stultus . . . qui id pollicor, quod ille non potuit* is rendered 'suis-je ce fou . . . qui a promis ce qu'il n'a pu tenir', whereas grammar and context demand that *ille* should refer not to the *stultus* but to Marius Victorinus; p. 23, l. 16, *legisse* (the text actually has the meaningless misprint *legis*) is rendered as if it meant 'read', but it must mean 'chosen'; p. 49, l. 4, *quod a vero non abhorreat persuadere* is rendered 'me persuader que leur sentiment n'est pas incompatible avec la vérité' whereas it means 'convince me of something not inconsistent with known truths'; p. 113, ll. 23 ff., where uncertainty about the beginning of the main clause has led to a muddled translation.

Proof-reading seems to have been hasty. P. 11, l. 16, has a false reference to Cicero's *Laelius*, though the correct one stands on the opposite page. P. 45, note 1, speaks of Cicero's *De optimo genere interpretandi* (= *De opt. gen. oratorum*). P. 63, note 1, implies that Labourt is translating *praedicare*, while his text has *praedicari*. P. 90, l. 13, a hopelessly garbled critical note. P. 168, for *felonem* read



leonem. And there are far more trivial misprints than one expects in a Budé edition.

On p. 95, note 1, the editor offers a conjecture—*quae et accedere possunt et recedere instar undarum ac fluctuum, et a succedentibus sibi dominis occupantur pro quae et acc. poss., et recedere, et instar und. ac fluct. a succ. sibi dom. acc.*—which should certainly be accepted.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

G. FAVEZ: *Saint Jérôme peint par lui-même*. (Collection Latomus, xxxiii.) Pp. 54. Brussels: Latomus, 1958. Paper, B. fr. 80.

INSPIRED by a remark of P. Monceaux (*Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne*, 1924, p. 95), Professor Favez has carefully gone through the prefaces to Jerome's translations and commentaries—he recognizes 111 in all, varying in length from a few lines to several pages—to see what sort of picture the author paints of himself. The result is this attractively written little book.

After a brief introduction, Favez deals in seven chapters with Jerome as scholar, reader, writer, polemist, satirist, friend, and Christian, and sums up his observations in a short conclusion. Sources are scrupulously quoted, and a sample check showed every quotation to be accurate.

This is not the kind of book which attempts to say anything new. Nor indeed is it even exhaustive of its own subject-matter. Jerome reveals at least as much about himself in his letters as in his prefaces, and it might be argued that in the prefaces, designed for immediate publication, the picture is more likely to be deliberately falsified. Moreover, many topics are touched upon in the prefaces which receive fuller treatment elsewhere. For instance, one cannot satisfactorily discuss Jerome's interest in chronology, as Favez does on pp. 11–12, solely on the basis of synchronisms mentioned in the prefaces; and without any reference to his translation and adaptation of Eusebius's *Chronicle*.

Nevertheless, what emerges is a reasonably faithful portrait of the most learned of the fathers, with his irascibility and combativeness, his insatiable intellectual curiosity, his painstaking and sometimes pedantic precision, his snobbery, and his grave lack of Christian charity.

Jerome was the pupil of Donatus, brought up in the centuries-old tradition of ancient philology. He brings to the service of the church not only the technique of scrupulous

and exhaustive examination and explanation of a text, which was the task of the grammaticus *par excellence*. He also brought with him many of the attitudes and values of the grammaticus; he has all his touchiness and his resentment of rivals; he even has the same imagery of abuse—his rivals are *canes* who *latrant* or *mordent*, drunkards who *evomunt* or *regurgitant* their writings; personal abuse is often a substitute for argument; and pupils and protégés are watched over with possessively parental solicitude.

Another feature of the ancient philologist which we find reflected in Jerome is the unwillingness to generalize, the lack of interest in causes, the disinclination to see things as a whole. These abilities, which in antiquity were the mark of the historian or the man of affairs rather than of the literary scholar (compare the interesting remarks of A. Momigliano, 'L'eredità della filologia antica e il metodo storico', *Rivista Storica Italiana*, lxx [1958], 442–58, especially 444–5), Jerome's contemporary Augustine did possess, though as a scholar he could not hold a candle to Jerome. This aspect of Jerome's personality might have been developed by Favez.

Within the limits he has set himself Favez has written an intelligent and sympathetic study of Jerome. He is an unobtrusive guide. Only occasionally, as in the semi-apologetic discussions of Jerome's uncharitableness (pp. 35–39, 52–53), does he interpose himself between his subject and the reader. This book is a useful introduction to the study of Jerome.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

SAN AGUSTÍN: *La Ciudad de Dios*. Traducción de LORENZO RIBER, texto revisado por JUAN BASTARDAS. Vol. ii (Libros iii–v). Pp. 192 (double). Barcelona: Ediciones Alma Mater, 1958. Cloth.

THIS is the second volume of an edition of *De Civitate Dei*, the text prepared by Professor Bastardas of Barcelona, the translation made by Lorenzo Riber of the Spanish Royal Academy. It forms part of the *Colección Hispánica de Autores Griegos y Latinos* published with the aid of the Ministry of National Education, a fact which may explain its spacious presentation. Since these three books, out of twenty-two, occupy nearly 400 pages, the whole work will almost demand a shelf of its own.

The text is provided with the references for Augustine's numerous citations and with a select *apparatus criticus*. Presumably the editor's principles were explained in vol. i, which is not accessible to me. He cites seventeen manuscripts, including *Lugdunensis* 607, vi-vii cent., which is available for these books, and the former *Corbeiensis* of about the same date. In book iii, where comparison is possible, the text does not differ greatly from McCracken's (Loeb, 1957), but, while McCracken normally followed Dombart-Kalb (Teubner), Bastardas not infrequently agrees with Hoffmann (*C.S.E.L.*) against them, especially in accepting tolerable readings from *Lugdunensis* or *Corbeiensis*, e.g. in iii. 13 *conubia*, not *coniugia*, iii. 19 *Romanorum*, not *Romanum*, and *clade*, not *caede*. Most differences are on small points; more substantial is iii. 18 *aerei* with Hoffmann and most manuscripts against *aerii*, Dombart, McCracken. In iii. 27 Bastardas adheres to *Caesar et Fimbria* against Dombart's conjecture (accepted by Hoffmann, Kalb, McCracken) of *Caesares a Fimbria*, on the ground that, whatever the historical truth, Augustine's text of *Florus* must have read it.

The translation faces the text and has occasional historical footnotes. I am not competent to judge its literary quality. Except for a tendency to expand, it keeps close to the Latin, yet runs easily. This expansion, however, though it stops short of paraphrase, is indulged in somewhat freely; single words continually creep in, and phrases are very much longer than the original. *Documentum* is 'desgraciado experimento', *victus* becomes 'con el deshonor del vencimiento', *augur* is 'miembro del colegio de los augures', and the sentence in which it occurs, fourteen Latin words, takes thirty-six in Spanish. The simple *accitus etiam a Tarentinis* turns into 'también en aquella sazón llamado por los de Tarento en favor suyo'.

There is no obvious reason why English readers should use this edition. Spanish students are fortunate in having something at once so scholarly and so handsome.

S. L. GREENSLADE

Christ Church, Oxford

HÉLÈNE PÉTRÉ, KARL VRETSKA: *Die Pilgerreise der Aetheria (Peregrinatio Aetheriae)*. Pp. 280; 3 maps. Klosterneuburg bei Wien: Bernina-Verlag, 1958. Cloth.

PROFESSOR VRETSKA has adapted for the German-speaking public the excellent edi-

tion of the *Peregrinatio Aetheriae* by Mlle Pétré, published in the series 'Sources Chrétiennes' (Paris, 1948). He has translated her lengthy introduction and explanatory notes, added a few additional notes of his own, modified her text occasionally, particularly in the light of recent papers by Wistrand<sup>1</sup> and Weber,<sup>2</sup> made a German translation, and appended the text, together with a German translation, of the letter of Valerius of Vierzo (Bergidensis) *de beatissimae Aetheriae laude*.

Pétré's introduction and notes deal at length and sensibly with problems of topography, archaeology, and liturgy arising in connexion with the *Peregrinatio*, but leave untouched its linguistic side, as falling outside both the interest and the competence of the general reader. Vretska endeavours in his translation 'den eigentümlichen Stil der Aetheria... auch für jene fühlbar zu machen, die des Lateins unkundig sind' (p. 272). Whether he has succeeded or not the reviewer does not presume to judge, but his translation is throughout accurate and clear.

The unique manuscript is somewhat vaguely described as an eleventh-century manuscript from a monastery in Arezzo. The general reader is unlikely to want to consult it, but he ought to be told where to find it, namely in the library of the Fraternità di S. Maria at Arezzo, with the pressmark VI. 3, and he might be interested to know that it is also the sole authority for two works of Hilary of Poitiers, and that it was written for Abbot Desiderius of Monte Cassino, the future pope Victor III. A few fragments of the *Peregrinatio*, showing a somewhat divergent text, were published from a ninth-century Toledo manuscript, now in the Biblioteca Nacional at Madrid, by de Bruyne in the *Revue Bénédictine*, xxvi (1909), 481 ff. This is not mentioned by the editor.

The text is substantially that of Geyer. In a few passages the editor retains the manuscript reading, where all other editors have printed conjectures; e.g. p. 112. *de castro*, *qui ibi est*, p. 116. *5 Pithona etiam civitas... ostensum est nobis*, p. 126. *20 ubicumque ad loca desiderata accedere volebamus*, p. 220. *24 ad columnam illam, ad quem flagellatus est Dominus*. This conservatism is probably justified, and in three of the four passages quoted is supported by Löfstedt in his *Philologischer*

<sup>1</sup> E. Wistrand, *Textkritisches zur Peregrinatio Aetheriae*, Göteborgs Vetenskaps- och Vitterhets-Samhälles Handl. 5, F. Ser. A. VI. 1, 1955.

<sup>2</sup> R. Weber, *Notes sur le texte de la Peregrinatio*, *V. Chr.*, 1952, pp. 178-82.

*Kommentar*. At p. 118. 6 *statuae exclusae* is printed, where Geyer and others emend to *excisae*. Although Löfstedt argued in favour of the manuscript reading, his arguments are not altogether convincing. Sittl's suggestion *excusae*—with a half-conscious reminiscence of Virgil—seems most attractive. At p. 176. 16, where we now know from Weber that the manuscript actually has *lecto omni*, there seems to be no need to print *lectus omnis actus* when *lecto omni actu* is palaeographically more probable and gives a better balanced sentence.

In her note on the deaconess Marthana (p. 176) the editor observes that she is mentioned by Basil of Seleucia. If matters were as simple as that, those who date the work in the sixth century would not have a leg to stand on. But the Life of St. Thecla attributed to Basil, in which the mention occurs, is of disputed authorship (cf. Schmid-Stählin, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, ii. 2. 1487).

The transliteration of Arabic place-names in the introduction and commentary shows a curious mixture of French and German conventions, e.g. *Dschebel Mousa*, *Wahdi* [sic] *er-Râhah*, *naqb el Haoua*. This should be tidied up in a new edition. The typography is accurate and elegant, the binding good, and the maps rather poor and without a scale. The title on the cover is not the same as that on the title-page.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

BERTHE M. MARTI: *Arnulfus Aurelianensis, Glosule super Lucanum*. Pp. lxxvi+599. Rome: American Academy, 1958. Paper.

ARNULF was a teacher at Orléans towards the end of the twelfth century, who wrote commentaries on Ovid and Lucan; those on the *Fasti* may soon be published. He was rightly identified by Hauréau with the Rufus or Rufinus (red-head) satirized by Matthew of Vendôme for his low birth, vulgarity, pedantry, and bad versification. Weber confused him with an earlier Arnulf who was a bishop. Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century*, incorrectly calls him Master Arnold: the two names are separate, Arnold meaning 'eagle-rule', Arnulf 'eagle-wolf'.

Dr. Marti's edition of Arnulf's commentary occupies 3 pages of *accessus* and 524 of text and apparatus criticus. Book i takes up 82 pages, Book ii 66 (whereas viii runs only to 36, vii only to 40, despite Housman's assertion that it was the most read). Thus Arnulf far surpasses in bulk the other pub-

lished scholia, *Adnotationes in Lucanum* and *Commenta Bernensia*. But mere size does not make notes valuable, and since of these 'plurimae sunt futiles, indoctae, magna ex parte res minutissimas tractant' (Weber), we have to ask whether the whole of Arnulf's Lucan was worth publishing. Perhaps to forestall such a question from classical scholars, Dr. Marti stresses the value of the commentary to two other branches of scholarship. The student of medieval education can now read the lecture-notes of a typical *magister* not merely in extracts but as a whole. Moreover, Arnulf is one source of the historical novel *Li Fet des Romains*.

The editor's introduction discusses what is known of Arnulf's life and works, the influence on him of his predecessors and contemporaries (an appendix lists parallels in Hugutio's *Magnae Derivationes*), his method and terminology, the extent of his knowledge, his text of Lucan (it usually favours GUV, and at vii. 489-520 follows U's order of lines), and the manuscripts of his commentary. This was used by successive *magistri*, and later manuscripts tend to be interpolated; among these, Weber's fifteenth-century Venetus is not mentioned. One cannot agree that 'information about place names . . . is usually given . . . fairly accurately' (p. xlv): on Book vi we read *inter alia*: 17 EPYREA id est Dirachium quod est caput totius Epyri [misleading]; 76 QVOQVE MODO id est qua mensura spatii Tiberis a fonte suo [Lucan says *praecipit moenia*] in occasum distat si recto itinere eat; 90 NISSIS ciuitas est . . . uel NISSVS gigas . . . [it is the island now called Nisida]; 331 CANDAVIA regio est [it is a town 45 miles east of Dyrrhachium]; 362 IONIO per quod Io transiit dum iret in Egiptum. And much of the topographical information is of the type i. 420 [S]ATIRI fluius est. On metre and prosody Arnulf is even more shaky than Dr. Marti's words (p. xl) would make the reader think; the passages involved are v. 624, where like others he confuses Thetis and Tethys, and vii. 633, where following the 'auctoritas' of Servius he imagines that by *aliae* Lucan meant *Alliae*.

On the credit side we find an anticipation, in less guarded language, of Housman's note on vi. 739-42 'foedi aliquid et obscaeni subest', and fewer gaps than in the other commentaries. But Arnulf is too prone to give several different explanations, and often betrays his ignorance of Roman institutions, e.g. vii. 217-18, where, not realizing that legions had numbers, he utters 30 lines of inanity. For some oddities in Book vii see on 12, 17-19, 26, 33 VADIS, 65, 88, 187, 274,

284 DOMINOS, 430, 468 (PERCVSSA pro percutiente), 581 SECUNDO ORDINE, 607, 780 DESCIRET [sic]. Arnulf's note on vii. 45 refers not to v. 741 but to vii. 1-6. At vii. 405 two glosses have been run into one; EO is a lemma on 406. At vii. 851 the lemma is presumably misquoted.

The editing of such a vast mass of notes from seven manuscripts is a Herculean task well tackled; it is only a pity that Arnulf himself is so unrewarding of the editor's care. Material has at least been provided for the *Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis*. The large index, which does not cover the introduction, is accurate and useful.

O. A. W. DILKE

University of Glasgow

FRITZ STURM: *Abalienatio*. Pp. 230. Milan: Giuffrè, [1958]. Paper, L. 1,200.

THIS book was presented as a doctoral thesis in the University of Lausanne, and is an admirably thorough example of the thesis which puts a very small subject under a very large microscope. The precise subject is indicated by the sub-title, 'Essai d'explication de la définition des Topiques (Cic. *Top.* 5, 28)', but in fact there is a good deal more to be found here than this might suggest. For the author is led into an examination of several very different questions. For example, he collates a large number of manuscripts of Boethius's commentary on the passage of Cicero; he examines once again the question of the extent to which Cicero can be credited with legal learning and the question whether *in iure cessio* could be applied to *res nec mancipi*; he discusses the differences between the treatment of the methods of acquisition of property in the *Institutes* of Gaius and the *Regulae* of Ulpian. And everywhere the previous literature is summarized and examined very lucidly and thoroughly.

The central question is how to reconcile Cicero's definition of *abalienatio*, which seems to confine it to *mancipatio* and *in iure cessio*, with the fact that at any rate for Ulpian *alienatio* included *traditio*. After critically examining and rejecting the interpretations which have been offered from Boethius until now, the author goes on to consider whether the definition is Cicero's own or that of a jurist, and favours the latter answer. The central section of the book, which accounts for more than half its length, is then devoted to an exhaustive examination of the surviving occurrences of *abalienatio* (*abalienare*) and

*alienatio* (*alienare*) used in a legal sense, in order to dispose conclusively of the possibility that the two forms have different meanings. The contradiction between Cicero and Ulpian (and, by inference, Gaius) therefore remains. The author explains it by supposing that for the author of Cicero's definition *abalienatio* was necessarily confined to *mancipatio* and *in iure cessio*, because they alone were sufficient in themselves to effect a transfer of ownership—that they alone were abstract conveyances. *Traditio* was therefore excluded because it was causal—because it was not self-sufficient but depended on its accompanying facts. Ulpian, on the other hand, and, in a slightly different sense, Gaius were driven by the exigencies of systematic exposition to include also the *iuris gentium* method of *traditio*. This is ingenious, but it seems rather to restate the problem than to answer it. Granted that there is indeed no equivalence between *traditio* by itself on the one hand and *mancipatio* and *in iure cessio* on the other, it is still difficult to see why the Republican jurists should have closed their eyes to the obvious equivalence between the latter and *traditio-ex-iusta-cause*. To isolate *traditio* from its accompanying facts hardly seems to correspond to the way a lawyer would think. However, one may hesitate to accept the author's conclusion without thereby denying value or interest to the book. The author is particularly to be congratulated on the lucidity of his presentation.

BARRY NICHOLAS

Brasenose College, Oxford

A. G. TSOPANAKIS: *La Rhètre de Lycurgue, L'Annexe, Tyrée*. ('Ελληνικά, παράρτ. 6.) Pp. 84. Salonika: 'Εταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν, 1954. Paper, dr. 25.

IN the preface to this short work (received in 1957) it is explained that the author, a philologist, was drawn to the perennial problem of the emendation and interpretation of the *Rhetra* of Lycurgus (Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 6) by way of a philological examination of the corruption—*αγοριαν*—which it contains. This approach may account for the limited historical consideration of the problems involved, which detracts more than a little from the value of the work. It is, however, of some importance for the ideas expressed in it, for they sometimes depart very strikingly from those of other scholars. The problem is tackled by way of the

Rhetra first, then the Rider, then Tyrtaeus frs. 3<sup>a</sup> and 3<sup>b</sup>, in such a way that in discussing the Rhetra the author commits himself from time to time to irritating question-begging observations on the Rider (cf. pp. 13 and 32), especially when rejecting the emendation ἀνταγορίαν in the Rhetra. Furthermore, there is insufficient background discussion on the relations of Kings and Gerousia, and on the position of the Ephors, to say nothing of the problems of date: cf. p. 22: 'Pour mieux comprendre le problème qui nous occupe et mieux définir les possibilités de Lycurgue et les droits de l'assemblée à cette époque, il est indispensable de réexaminer l'apport de la poésie homérique.' What epoch is meant? Cf. p. 28: 'Pour Sparte, avant et jusqu'à Lycurgue. . .'. No date is suggested, though one is inferred before Polydorus and Theopompus. The author also attaches great importance to the interpretations given by Plutarch, yet later (p. 59) casts serious doubt on his trustworthiness.

He would emend the most vexed passage of the Rhetra (Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 6. 3: γαμῶδαν γορίαν ἢ μὴν καὶ κράτος (οἱ γηριωνοὶ μὴν)) to γαῖάδαν ἰθεῖαν ἔμεν καὶ κράτος, where γαῖάδαν is suggested from Hesychius's γαῖάδας: ὁ δῆμος ὑπὸ Λακῶνων. ἰθεῖαν, suggested as the original underlying the corruption γορίαν (see p. 34), is taken as the antonym of σκολιάν in the Rider, and justified by the parallel εὐθείας of Tyrtaeus (line 6, see pp. 64–65). This emended version Tsopanakis interprets as a requirement that the Damos shall approve (proposals introduced by the Kings and the Gerousia) clearly (ἰθεῖαν ἔμεν) and unanimously (καὶ κράτος). Philologists and palaeographers will be the best judges of his suggestions (pp. 33–36), on which he clearly does not feel too happy himself (p. 35). The historian will focus his attention on the relation of this emendation to ἀφίστασθαι of the Rhetra and ἀποστατήρες of the Rider, and the difficult clause of the Rider αἱ δὲ σκολιάν ὁ δῆμος ἔροιτο. Μφίστασθαι Tsopanakis interprets as 'judge', 'decide', 'sanction', i.e. after the unambiguous acclamation of the Damos. With an eye to the ἀποστατήρες of the Rider Tsopanakis also suggests an original sense for ἀφίστασθαι of 'séparer ou éloigner deux portions, deux parties' (p. 37). All this again is a matter of lexicography, but it emerges that the ἀποστατήρες of the Rider are not 'dismissers' but 'dividers' or 'counters of votes', when the acclamation of the Damos (cf. Thuc. i. 87 (of Sthenelaidas): οὐκ ἔφη διαγινώσκειν τὴν βοήν ὅσοι τὰ μελλόν . . .) was uncertain in its import. This interpretation

of the term depends on the sense of αἱ δὲ σκολιάν ὁ δῆμος ἔροιτο of the Rider. Tsopanakis interprets σκολιάν as 'complicated', 'confused', 'difficult to understand'; that is, as a reference to the confused reactions of the Damos which might arise from divergent proposals of the Gerousia (cf. p. 44). In such cases acclamation without a counting of votes would be an ineffective means of discovering the majority opinion. For this meaning of σκολιάν Tsopanakis marshals a not unimpressive body of evidence. The implications for the position and powers of the Damos and for its relations to the Gerousia are very considerable. The same is true for the nature of the connexion between Rhetra and Rider, their probable dates and association with crucial periods in Spartan history. These implications are insufficiently debated, though they are the ultimate test of Tsopanakis's interpretations. This is not to say, however, that his suggestions are unworthy of attention, as yet one more attempt to extract sense from a sadly corrupted text.

University of Sheffield

R. J. HOPPER

MOSES HADAS: *A History of Rome from its Origins to A.D. 529 as told by the Roman Historians*. Pp. viii+232; 8 plates, 4 maps. London: Bell, 1958. Cloth, 18s. 6d. net.

THE dust-cover explains the origins of the book. 'A *History of Rome* was originally published in New York in the famous Doubleday Anchor series and proved popular with a public far beyond the confines of those usually interested in classical history.' It is therefore another example of those works produced in the United States for a non-specialist public which lay considerable stress on sources in translation. The aim is praiseworthy. The book is, in fact, composed of lengthy passages from classical and later authors dealing with the history of Rome (including such related sources as Cicero's speeches and the *Res Gestae*) linked by italicized sections of narrative, sometimes very short, composed by Professor Hadas. So short at times are these connecting sections that the omissions are often of a really serious character; and inaccuracies appear, produced in the attempt at great brevity and by the absence of the possibility of qualifying statements. On the other hand, as far as the present reviewer has checked them, the translations, which are by Professor Hadas, are reasonably accurate and adhere



fairly closely to the originals, though there are slips here and there. The choice of passages is a very different matter. The problem which faced Professor Hadas is the one which faces every teacher of Ancient History when he attempts to prepare a selection of source material for an extended period of history. The selection is likely to be either inadequate or inordinately lengthy in general background sources, and certain specialized aspects such as religion and political thought will present problems. Inscriptions will be either very numerous or very few, and in need of a commentary. In this book there are, for example, in Chapter i (Kings and Early Republic) extensive narrative passages from Livy on relatively unimportant themes, and brief, very brief summaries dealing with the expansion of Rome in Italy and the Pyrrhic War (compressed into less than two pages). To be sure it is pointed out in the preface that 'It is the literary tradition that this book attempts to summarize', and it is true that the Roman ideas of the early history of the city are very important. On the other hand, it is far from true that 'for apprehending the contribution of Rome to subsequent European history the actual experience is less important than the ancients' conception and interpretation of it and the form in which they transmitted it to posterity and in which posterity, until the nineteenth century, accepted it'. In any case both the selection and the summaries are inadequate to give a fair idea of the vast period from 753 B.C. to A.D. 529 (in effect to 565). The degree of compression or omission will be made clear by a list of the chapter divisions and the space they are given: (i) 753-275 B.C., 'Kings and Early Republic', pp. 1-20; (ii) 265-133 B.C., 'Mediterranean Conquests', pp. 22-36; (iii) 133-31 B.C., 'A Century of Revolution', pp. 37-70; (iv) 27 B.C. to A.D. 69, 'The Early Empire', pp. 71-92; (v) A.D. 69-193, 'Flavians and Antonines', pp. 93-115; (vi) A.D. 193-235, 'The Severi', pp. 116-28; (vii) A.D. 235-85, 'Thirty Tyrants', pp. 129-39; (viii) A.D. 285-367, 'Diocletian and the Constantines', pp. 140-60; (ix) A.D. 367-95, 'The End of the United Empire', pp. 161-74; (x) A.D. 395-527, 'The Empire Divided', pp. 175-201; (xi) A.D. 527-65, 'Justinian', pp. 202-218. It is to be wondered why the book is carried on so far. A shorter period and a fuller collection of material would have been better. In general it must be admitted that the book reads tolerably well, but it will not test the intelligence of its readers very severely, and it is hard to see what qualities it possesses which would not have been

present in a well-written elementary History of Rome of the conventional sort.

R. J. HOPPER

University of Sheffield

GAETANO DE SANCTIS: *Storia dei Romani*. Vol. iv: *La fondazione dell'Impero*, Parte ii: *Vita e pensiero nell'età delle grandi conquiste*, tomo ii. Pp. viii+125. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1957. Paper, L. 1,300.

This volume was designed to provide a sketch of the development of Roman law before the Gracchan revolution and also to treat of the financial and economic evolution of Rome in this period. At its author's death, however, only the essay on the law was completed, and it is here published under the title 'Dal diritto quiritorio al diritto pretorio'.

The reader is offered in some 35,000 words the main features of the Roman law in this period, with particular stress, as the title indicates, on the Praetorian enlargement of the narrow civil law. This last is not a simple undertaking. The century preceding the Gracchan revolution was crucial for the subsequent development of Roman law. This much is certain, but very little else. In these circumstances any account of the law of the period can be little more than a linking of what we know of the primitive law to the vigorous lines of development which become discernible in the last century B.C. For the most part the picture must be a composite one obtained by projecting the image of the early classical law on to a background of the XII Tables. Such a picture is inevitably idiosyncratic in its emphasis. Indeed at times one wishes it were more so. Where the book is most interesting is, as would be expected, where the author either pursues relatively at length some special interest (e.g. the distinction between *res mancipi* and *res non mancipi* pp. 68 ff.), or places an institution in its social or political context (e.g. his remarks on the interdependence of *patria potestas* over the family and *patrum auctoritas* over the state, pp. 37 f.). There is much of this kind to reward the reader, as there is also in his introductory remarks on the characteristics of Roman law and Roman lawyers (e.g. their 'consequenzialità'—their propensity for going on drawing the logical consequences of a rule long after its original purpose had become obsolete). Again he is far more likely to look for Greek contrasts and parallels than most writers on Roman



law. But where, to one reader at least, he is least rewarding is where he is packing a large amount of information (e.g. on actions) into a few pages. Not many readers are likely to come to this book for detailed factual information. Indeed in some respects they would be unwise to do so. Any account of this length of so conjectural a subject is bound, if it is to be readable, to be more dogmatic than the evidence justifies, and almost every page provides material for argument. Very occasionally his grasp of technical detail seems to falter (e.g. *separatio bonorum* seems to be misconceived on p. 60, and three pages later the attribution of the edictal clause *unde cognati* to the second century seems to ignore Cic. *Part. Orat.* 98).

But it is not for matter such as this that any right-minded reader will look, but rather for the reflections of a great historian on a subject too much left to specialists.

Brasenose College, Oxford    BARRY NICHOLAS

HANS OPPERMANN: *Caesar, Wegbereiter Europas*. Pp. 111; map. Göttingen: Musterschmidt-Verlag, 1958. Paper, DM 3.60.

HERE, in a 30,000 word paper-back, Professor Hans Oppermann (author in 1933 of *Caesar, der Schriftsteller und sein Werk*) gives a short, business-like account of the man to whose name and career 'das Kaisertum' owed its origins. The story of the career of Julius Caesar is clearly and succinctly told against the background of politics in Rome and problems on the imperial frontiers. It is a remarkable achievement to crowd so much information into such short space, to present it so readably, and, where generalizations are inevitable, so rarely to make an observation which is likely to disturb even the most fastidious. Where our knowledge is limited, the fact is recognized; for instance, 'wieweit er seinen großen Einfluß auf Frauen in den Dienst seiner politischen Ziele gestellt hat, ist schwer zu sagen'. On Caesar's final political aims, Oppermann states the simple objection to the view of Meyer and others, that Caesar contemplated imposing on Rome a Hellenistic form of divine monarchy—the fact that, under close examination, the ancient evidence for such a view simply evaporates. He thinks with Mommsen that Caesar contemplated 'einer Erneuerung des altitalischen Königtums', rule not, of course, with the title of Rex, but as Dictator and Imperator.

There is no room, naturally, for notes or

references; nor do digressions anywhere distract from the fast-moving narrative. The book, easy reading in itself, is made the more attractive by being printed in admirably clear type on very good paper.

Exeter College, Oxford    J. P. V. D. BALSDON

ALBERT ESSER: *Cäsar und die Julisch-Claudischen Kaiser im biologisch-ärztlichen Blickfeld*. Pp. xii+270; 44 figs. Leiden: Brill, 1958. Cloth, fl. 95.

EVERY few years a book with a title of this kind appears, is translated into a number of European languages, and attracts a considerable reading public. No such enviable future awaits this present book; it is far too good for that. Its author is Professor of the History of Medicine in the Medical School of Düsseldorf, and he writes with complete authority on his subject.

The ancient evidence, whose unprofessional quality a doctor naturally deplores, is of two sorts. There is the literary evidence of the biographer, the anecdotist, the historian, and the encyclopaedist; and there is iconographic evidence, chiefly from statues and coins. In the first case there is the difficulty (as Esser points out) of distinguishing *facta* from *facta*, and this is, perhaps, a greater difficulty than he allows. Nightmares and sleeplessness, for instance, are by historical convention in antiquity, occupational disorders of 'tyrannical man'. In the second case Esser accepts without question the hypotheses of Ludwig Curtius and, unrivalled as Curtius's genius was in this field, he was sometimes demonstrably wrong—for instance in his identification of the central figure in the grand cameo of Paris as Gaius Caligula instead of Germanicus. A weakness of Esser himself (which need not be too much stressed) is that, apart from C. W. King, *Antique Gems and Rings* (1872), and an American work on the portraiture of Claudius, he does not appear to have read any books written by historians outside Germany on, in particular, the administrative qualities of the emperors of whom he treats.

That Julius Caesar was an epileptic is certain; and there may, it seems, have been latent genuine epilepsy in Antony. It appeared, by heredity, twice later, in Gaius and in Britannicus, Gaius was 'probably schizoid, if not schizophrenic'. It is for Claudius that the most complete clinical description exists (including the goddess Fever who never left his side, even on his short journey to heaven). Esser discusses the possibilities: hereditary

weaknesses, pre-natal encephalitis, meningitis contracted in childhood, multiple sclerosis. The last is his tentative diagnosis. In the case both of Claudius and of Tiberius he writes with great sympathy of the psychological qualities easily to be attributed to childhood and upbringing. Was Claudius a second Lucius Junius Brutus, and was there in his younger days a method in his madness? Tiberius is judged entirely healthy and entirely sane. He may have scorned doctors for himself, preferring astrologers and having pronounced vegetarian idiosyncrasies (often, it appears, a quality of those who disparage the medical profession); but, as Esser points out, no general has ever taken greater pains over ensuring that his troops had proper medical attention.

The book is full of interest (the note on page 242 on the relation of taking hellebore in antiquity to taking snuff today is strongly recommended) and full of value. Nobody could possibly set out today to write a biography of any of the early emperors without studying its findings very carefully indeed.

Exeter College, Oxford J. P. V. D. BALSDON

CORDULA BRUTSCHER: *Analysen zu Suetons Divus Julius und der Parallel-überlieferung*. (Noctes Romanae, 8.) Pp. 146. Bern: Haupt, 1958. Paper, 13.40 Sw. fr.

THE second part of the title of this work is no less important than the first, since the analysis of some aspects of Caesar's career by authors other than Suetonius is treated in considerable detail, and Suetonius' own account is by no means always in the foreground. Dr. Brutscher's main purpose is to examine the contrasting ways in which different writers regarded Caesar and used their material to illustrate their views of him: she is less concerned with the historicity of the events themselves. She believes that Suetonius tried to give a balanced and objective judgement, by choosing pro- and anti-Caesarian views from the material that he collected, and then blending them into a whole. Suetonius' division of his material makes Caesar's political career appear very swift, and Caesar thus appears to be pushing his way forward very powerfully; by concentrating on Caesar and neglecting his opponents (e.g. Pompey), Suetonius presents a somewhat unbalanced portrait of Caesar: the interaction of events is lacking and Caesar is left rather *in vacuo*. Until at least his first consulship Caesar is driven on

less by ambition than by hatred of the Optimates. Thus, while Haenisch believed that in his first 33 chapters Suetonius simply followed the chronology and while Steidle regarded 'die sachlichen Gesichtspunkte' as more important, Brutscher believes that Suetonius here gave exactly what he found in his sources, namely Caesar's struggle with the Senate. Plutarch finds the dominant motive in Caesar's ambition and concentrates on this: thus he says little about Caesar's youthful *ἐρωτικά*, not from a sense of modesty but because he believed that Caesar was little affected in his political aims by women at this stage. Dr. Brutscher regards Appian as the most skilful writer of the four whom she discusses: he is graphic and generally convincing, stressing psychological motives, though his love of the dramatic leads him to telescope events chronologically (e.g. the Vettius affair). Dio has a stronger historical sense, uses older sources, and renounces dramatic elaborations. These general conclusions arise from a full analysis of some of the chief episodes of Caesar's life, e.g. his early career, the First Triumvirate, the outbreak of the Civil War (Caesar's own neglect to emphasize the significance of the crossing of the Rubicon is shown to be due to its lack of military importance: his plans were already laid, and the episode only gained in significance as a step to power when his career was regarded from the standpoint of the Principate: hence the later elaborations of the incident), the conspiracy and murder. Thus the work throws an interesting light on the methods and standpoints of four authors.

H. H. SCULLARD

King's College, London

EMIL KUNZE: *VI. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Olympia*. Pp. 225; 83 plates, 138 figs. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1958. Paper, DM. 48.

THIS instalment of the *Olympia Berichte*, as usual, contains reports on excavations and special studies of objects. Kunze opens with an outline of field-work in the seasons 1953-4 and 1954-5. Two discoveries are especially notable. First, the so-called Byzantine fortification was built in the second half of the third century A.D. and of materials got by the deliberate demolition of the buildings outside it. Secondly, chippings of ivory, ornaments of glass, and terra-cotta moulds were found near the traditional workshop of Phidias and must belong to his great chryselephantine statue of Zeus; in some

of these moulds glass was evidently cast and in others presumably gold sheet was beaten. A. Mallwitz describes in more detail the excavation south of the Cladeus baths. Here occupation began in the fifth century B.C. A mill turned by animals, of or even before the early fourth century B.C., is much the oldest of its kind known in Greece. The Roman pottery is interesting typologically. Next Kunze makes additions to his earlier publications of metal attachments to shields; here he concentrates on decorated arm-bands. He continues with a careful and important study of helmets of the 'Kegel' and 'Illyrian' types: it is worth repeating that the 'Illyrian' helmet, which owes much to the Corinthian, is in both origin and development Greek. Some decorated bronze strips, presumably from the frames and panels of wooden chests, are investigated by H.-V. Hermann. Kunze returns with more terra-cotta sculpture-fragments of a good Athena and soldiers from a group of about 490 B.C. and some fragments of other soldiers of about the same date. H. Walter publishes a terra-cotta statuette of Pan, a Hellenistic work of some spirit, and a marble copy of an early Classical bearded head. Finally, F. Eckstein offers eight new inscriptions dating from the third century B.C. to the third A.D.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

*Études d'Archéologie Classique, I. (Annales de l'Est, publ. par la Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Nancy, Mémoire no. 19.)* Pp. 166; 29 plates. Paris: de Boccard, 1958. Paper.

THIS volume is a memorial to the enterprise of the late Jean Bérard. In 1955 and 1956 at the beginning of the academic year he organized colloquia at his university of Nancy, in which established archaeologists were to discourse on particular themes and the present state of knowledge and ignorance. For advanced students and specialists these papers must have been duly provoking. But the lack of detailed argument and references makes them less satisfactory for solitary reading, and it was hardly fair on their authors to publish them in this form. P. Amandry discusses the origins of attachments to Archaic cauldrons and what may be called Greco-Persian metalwork: his suggestions are worth considering. J. Bayet expounds with satisfaction the recent French excava-

tions at Megara Hyblaea and Bolsens. J. Bérard espies an historical basis in the legends of Heroic colonies in Italy and Sicily. F. Chamoux speculates about the original aspect of the arch at Saint Rémy. P.-M. Duval ponders on amphitheatres, especially those used also as theatres. J.-J. Hatt advocates recourse to stratigraphy in the excavation of historical sites and adds notes on the common (and sigillata) pottery of Roman Gaul. L. Lacroix reviews the blazons of Greek cities. R. Martin makes some thoughtful observations on the volute and the leaf capitals of Greek Asia. J. Tréheux offers a neat hypothesis to explain the thirteen walls of the Chalkotheke at Athens. E. Vill pronounces rhetorically on the economic consequences of archaeological evidence, but does not think deep enough. It seems from the title that these *Études* are to be continued.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

RICHARD HUBBARD HOWLAND: *The Athenian Agora, IV; Greek Lamps and their Survivals*. Pp. ix+252; 56 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1958. Cloth, \$12.50.

LAMPS are common in Greek habitations from the Archaic period onwards. Artistically they are generally negligible, but since the types change they are useful to excavators for dating their deposits. So we must pity and praise the author of this ascetic research, in which he has been involved since 1938. Howland has confined himself to the 'Greek' lamps from the Agora of Athens, that is to types established before Sulla's coming in 86 B.C. and the descendants of those types. Out of 2,000 specimens inventoried he has selected over 800 for his catalogue, classifying them in 58 types, some of them subdivided. Their dating is secured by contexts observed in the excavations. Each type is described carefully, its frequency is noted, and its connexions are examined. The illustrations—drawings of profiles and photographs from above—are ample. A convenient chart shows the lifetime of each type, and there are good indexes. Points of more general interest are that there are no Iron Age lamps earlier than the seventh century B.C., that some lamps and pots were probably made in the same workshops, and that makers' signatures began in

the second century B.C. Howland seems to have done his work accurately and thoroughly, and excavators and cataloguers of museums should be grateful to him.

R. M. COOK

*Museum of Classical Archaeology,  
Cambridge*

RAYMOND THOUVENOT: *Maisons de Volubilis: Le Palais dit de Gordien et la Maison à la Mosaïque de Venus*. (Publ. de la Service des Antiquités du Maroc, fasc. 12.) Pp. 86; 24 plates, 9 plans. Rabat: Service des Antiquités du Maroc, 1958. Paper.

VOLUBILIS, a Mauretanian town which after the destruction of Carthage by the Romans received substantial elements of neo-Punic culture, perhaps became one of the residences of the last client king of Mauretania but one, Juba, who died in A.D. 40. In the early years of Claudius' reign, after the country had been provincialized, it received the status of a *municipium* in view of the services of its inhabitants to Rome in the troubles which followed the execution of the last king by Gaius. From then on, in spite of its proximity to the limit of Roman territory in the area, it flourished for over two centuries until its evacuation by Diocletian. Excavations on the site during the last thirty years or so have laid bare and preserved a substantial part of the city, which in spite of, or perhaps because of, its remote position, is further testimony to the urbanization of apparently unprepossessing areas of north Africa.

The volume under review is a report on two of the larger houses. The first, the 'Palace of Gordian', is so called from an inscription found inside it recording the reconstruction of a *domus* and baths by a provincial governor under Gordian III. There seems no reason to doubt that the inscription refers to the house in which it was found, though the house had not always been imperial property. It is situated on the *decumanus maximus* and is one of the largest buildings in the city (69 × 74 m.). The second house derives its name from one of the mosaics, and is about half the size of the first. Both are in the north-east quarter which contained the houses of the wealthier inhabitants.

The excavations have been primarily directed towards laying bare and preserving the buildings in their final forms. The precise dates and nature of the several stages of

alteration and rebuilding are uncertain, though the earliest form of the 'Palace' has been determined; it probably dates from the early second century. In its final stage it had over forty rooms, including, remarkably enough, a row of ten shops along its front. Among the more notable features of the building are the local type of Corinthian capitals of the second century, and some extremely rustic capitals from the peristyle of the baths, probably of middle or late third-century date. Along the front of the building was a colonnade of fifteen columns with Ionic capitals, which are not common in Africa.

The smaller house has a number of mosaics in addition to the one after which it was named, whereas the 'Palace' has none. They are not all of the same period, but would seem to have been made from local designs in spite of such traditional subjects as Hylas and the Nymphs, and Diana and Nymphs Bathing. There is a certain attractive vigour in the unsophisticated treatment of the subjects, especially perhaps in a rather damaged scene of a chariot race in the circus in which the vehicles are drawn by ducks and peacocks.

The most notable find (made in 1944) in this house and its immediate vicinity was of three bronzes to add to the remarkable series already discovered at Volubilis. They have been published before, but are conveniently if briefly discussed again in this volume. The most controversial is a fine bust of a young man inscribed with the name CATO. The lettering would seem hardly to be from before the end of the first century A.D. but the bust itself may well be Julio-Claudian; the limited amount of idealization is chiefly in the expression of thoughtful repose. If this bust is ultimately derived from a real portrait it must be of Cato (Uticensis) in his earlier years. The other two are late Hellenistic; the first is a bust of a young man wearing a diadem; the features are superficially handsome but the artist has not disguised a look of arrogance and self-indulgence. Various possibilities among Hellenistic princes are discussed as models for the portrait, but all are hypothetical. Both these busts are in an excellent state of preservation. The last bronze is of a very different type, being an example of the realistic treatment of humble people, in this case an old fisherman. It would no longer seem necessary to attribute all such productions to Alexandria as is done by the author. M. Thouvenot rightly has a word of caution about the theory of Carcopino that the bronzes and other objects of early date found at Volubilis derive ultimately from a collection made by Juba, but

the occurrence of these pieces in one place is remarkable and they deserve further study.

B. H. WARMINGTON

University of Bristol

*Arctos (Acta Philologica Fennica)*: Nova Series, Vol. ii. Pp. 220. Helsinki: Klassillis-Filologinen Yhdistys, 1958. Paper, 1,500 mk.

The volume is dedicated to J. Sundwall, formerly Professor at Åbo, whose eightieth birthday was in 1957.

P. Aalto, 'Marginal Notes on the Minoan Linear B'; P. Brunn, 'The Disappearance of Sol from the Coins of Constantine'; R. Hakamies, 'Remarques lexicographiques sur le latin médiéval de Finlande'; K. E. Henriksson, 'Epigraphica Christiana Vaticana'; I. Kajanto, 'Notes on Livy's Conception of History'; E. Linkomies, 'De textu Petroniano recensendo'; E. Mikkola, 'Σχολή bei Aristoteles'; P. Oksala, 'Fides und Pietas bei Catull'; E. Palmén, 'Die lateinischen pronominalen Ortsadverbien in Kasusbedeutung'; T. Steinby, 'A Pontifical Document' (Dion. Hal. i. 74. 3); J. Suolahti, 'The Council of L. Cornelius P.f. Crus in the Year 49 B.C.'; J. Svennung, 'Numerierung von Fabrikaten und anderen Gegendständen in römischen Altertum'; H. Thesleff, 'On the Origin of the Genitive Absolute'; R. Westman, 'Textkritisches zu Senecas Dialogen'; H. Zilliaceus, 'Τραγωδία und δράμα in metaphorischer Bedeutung'.

GIUSEPPE RAMBELLI: *Studi di Filologia Classica*. Pp. 117. Pavia, 1958: obtainable from the author at Via Liguria 14, Pavia. Paper, L. 1,500.

This is the second of two volumes of collected studies by Signore Rambelli, none of which appears to have been published elsewhere. Its contents are more varied than those of the first, which dealt exclusively with ancient comedy.

On pp. 1-8 Rambelli argues that the choliambi of Persius form a single passage, though possibly not an entire poem. Persius is saying that he is neither an inspired poet, nor a mercenary pseudo-poet. *Dolosi spes nummi* = *dolosa spes nummi*. The point of this is not clear. That wealth is deceitful, in that it does not confer on its possessors the happiness it promises, was a commonplace:

cf. Xen. *Cyrop.* viii. 3. 41, Eur. *I.T.* 414-18, Boethius, *Consol.* iii. pr. 3.

On pp. 9-28 he comments on chs. 14 and 15 of the *Apocolocyntosis*. He shows great ingenuity in making a logically consistent whole out of what is really a series of self-contained episodes, such as we find in Old Comedy. Ronconi's arguments for a late date (Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*, Milan, 1947, ii-vi) are refuted. And the relation of this section of the *Apocolocyntosis* to *Herc. Fur.* 688-829 is inconclusively discussed.

On pp. 29-38 he argues that Hor. *Sat.* i. 10. 1-8 are not by Horace, but interpolated from an ancient commentary. There is nothing here that has not been said before and said better.

On pp. 39-64 he discusses the sources of Sen. *Herc. Fur.* 646-829. One of these he identifies, by a series of comparisons with Ps.-Apollodorus ii. 5. 12, with the 'Ἡρακλέους κατάβασις' postulated by Norden (ad v. 260 et alibi) as a source for *Aeneid* vi. This is convincing. He also points to a number of Ovidian reminiscences. These really prove nothing, since Seneca is steeped in Ovid in any case (cf. Ch. K. Kapnukajias, *Die Nachahmungstechnik Senecas in den Chorliedern des Hercules Furens und der Medea*, Diss. Leipzig, 1930).

In a long study of Catullus' 67th poem on pp. 65-88 he suggests that vv. 31-34 should be given to the interlocutor and not to the door. He then tries to reconstruct the facts underlying this obscure poem, and summarizes his reconstruction on p. 85. All one can say is that it is as plausible as any and more so than some. But there are simply not enough clues in the poem itself, which was meant to be intelligible only to those who knew the persons mentioned.

On pp. 89-104 Rambelli studies the Fragmentum Grenfellianum (Powell, *Collectedanea Alexandrina*, pp. 177-82; Diehl, *Anthol. Lyr.* 6. 197-200). He offers a tentative reconstruction of the fragmentary vv. 41-52 (p. 99), and explains τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἀδίκησιν (v. 22) in the light of Menander's use of ἀδίκημα and ἀτύχημα as erotic technical terms. He then reconstructs the plot thus: the girl has been victim of an assault at some religious festival, and the man has seized upon this as an excuse to jilt her, thereby revealing the insincerity of his earlier ardours. She appeals to him, nevertheless, to return to her and marry her. The poem, Rambelli suggests, is not strictly a paracausithyron, but a semi-dramatic piece designed to be rendered by an actor.

Five textual notes make up the rest of the book (pp. 105-17). In Tac. *Dial.* 1. 3

Rambelli suggests, rather neatly, 'ita non ingenio, sed memoria et recordatione opus est, ut quae a praestantissimis viris et ex-cogitata subtiliter et dicta praverit accipi, <ea> cum singuli diversas quidem sed probabiles causas adferrent . . . persequar', and gives a not very persuasive explanation of how this might be corrupted to the meaningless *diversas vel easdem sed probabiles* of the manuscripts. In Menander fr. 543. 1 Körte he wants to read μένων (= standing his ground) for the corrupt μένος, but does not suggest how the line is to be scanned. Elter's ἐμμενῶς remains the most plausible conjecture here. In Isaeus 2.27 he rejects ἡ οἰκία after χωρίον ἢ συνοικίαν on the ground that later in the same speech (para. 35) the litigant admits that he received from the estate an οἰκίδιον ὃ ἐστὶν οὐκ ἀξίων τριῶν μῶν. But is an οἰκίδιον the same as an οἰκία in Attic law? In Aesch. Ag. 1458-61 he defends the reading of FTr, explaining it as by *tractio inversa* for νῦν δὲ τέλειαν πολύμναστον ἐπην-θίσω δι' αἵμ' ἀνιπτον ἐριν ἐρίδματος ἀνδρός οἰζύν, ἥτις ἦν τότε ἐν δόμοις. The parallels he quotes for the *tractio inversa* are not good, as in none is an adjective left in the accusative

(here τέλειαν) after the noun which it qualifies has been attracted into the nominative. In spite of Fraenkel's note on this passage he translates δι' αἵμα as 'per via d'un sangue', and apparently he takes πολύμναστον with αἵμα. He will not convince many. In Aesch. Sept. 146 he suggests οὐ δ' αἴτιος for the corrupt αὐτᾶς, without attempting to justify the irregular responsion involved. In v. 363 of the same play he wishes to read τλήμεν for the unmetrical τλήμονες and ὦν for ὡς, suggesting that the chorus speaks of itself as future δμῳίδες in these lines. The trouble is that all the parallel verbs are in the present tense. Butler's suggestion that νέα τλήμονες conceals a gloss on καὶνοπήμενες still seems the best approach to this corrupt passage.

Rambelli has a curiously long-winded style of exposition. And his method of close logical analysis is excellent in principle, but is sometimes misapplied; in literature as in life, people are sometimes illogical. There are far too many misprints, only a few of which are noted in the corrigenda at the end.

ROBERT BROWNING

University College, London

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

ERANOS

LVI, 3-4 (1958)

Emily A. Welf, *The Date of Aeschylus' Danaid Trilogy*: discusses the plot as a preliminary to a comparison (which she does not draw) with the dramatic technique of the other plays: she suggests that the trilogy ended, not with a trial, but with the Danaids' change of heart and acceptance of marriage. W. Pötscher, *Zum Schluss der Sieben gegen Theben*: maintains that whereas 1005 ff. can form no part of Aeschylus' play, 861-75 need not be suspected. There is nothing linguistically dubious in them and their function in announcing the coming *threnos* is like that of *Persae* 532 ff. The introduction of the sisters is necessary, for the kin must be present at the *threnos*, whether they speak themselves or the chorus speaks on their behalf. I. Waern, *Zu Sophokles' Philoktetes* 142: argues that τό μοι ἐννεμε means 'tell me this', and that in *Iliad* iii. 176, adduced for the supposed use of τό = τῶ (therefore), τό is also a neuter accusative demonstrative. D. Tabachovitz,

*Zu den dem Wagenlenker Porphyrios gewidmeten Inschriften* (Kaibel no. 935, partly in A.P. xvi. 30): explains the terminology, with an excursus on a Byzantine use of ἐλεύθερος, 'of good birth', and ἐλευθέρα, 'wife'. H. Erkell, *Statius 'Silvae' I 1* [should be IV 1] *und das Templum Gentis Flaviae*: 17, *qui saecula mecum / instaurare paras* (spoken by Janus c. A.D. 94) has no reference to the secular games of A.D. 88; any New Year is also the beginning of an undefined long period. 37, *mecum altera saecula condas / et tibi longaeui renouabitur ara parentis*: the parent is Divus Vespasianus and his *ara* his mausoleum; when it needs repair, Domitian will still be there to see to it. S. Lundström, *Odoratio et adspiratio*: shows that Irenaeus used the former word to mean 'nostril' (1. 18. 1) and the latter to mean 'aspirated letter' (1. 15. 4), and discusses the use of abstract for concrete. B. Löfstedt, *Zum Gebrauch der lateinischen distributiven Zahlwörter*: continues from the previous fascicle his exhaustive treatment of this subject.



## MNEMOSTYNE

## 4TH SERIES, XI (1958), Fasc. 3

W. J. Verdenius, *Notes on Plato's Phaedo*: detailed notes on many points of textual criticism and interpretation, reviewing the editions of Hackforth and others. A. D. Leeman, *Some Comments on Fraenkel's Horace*: in *Epod.* 10, *Od.* i. 16, there is, despite F., some point in looking for personal allusions; H. wrote 'for a few highly educated men' (p. vii), not 'for any reader' (p. 74); F. is wrong in thinking that H. had no religious feelings of his own; *namque* (*Od.* i. 22. 9, i. 34. 5) does not introduce a paradigm; the autobiographical part of *Od.* iii. 4 shows H. building himself up as *ex humilis potens*; in *Epod.* 16 he claims the right of the *vates* to address the community. G. Zuntz, *A Note on Euripides Heraclidae* 207-11: *πάντων* here means 'in turn', not, as Richardson (*Mnem.* 1957), 'back again'. K. J. McKay, *Further Thoughts on Hesiod Theogony* 35: Verdenius (fasc. 1) might have quoted, to support his view of *ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῶν κτλ.*, *Porph. Plot.* 22; is the phrase an echo of *Il.* xxii. 122-6? J. C. Kamerbeek, *Περὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀρχῆς* (*Hdt.* viii. 142. 2): this phrase, followed by *ὁ ἀγὼν ἐγένετο*, can be defended, not by the anachronism 'because of your empire', but in the sense 'because of your unprovoked aggression'; cf. *Il.* iii. 100 and Leaf's note. G. J. de Vries, *Ad Clementis Alex. Protrept.* vi. 67. 1 *adnotatiuncula*: for *δοκῶσι σοφῶν* read *δοκῶσι σοφῶν*. H. Hill, *An Unnoticed Roman Allusion in Plautus*: *navim, metretas quae trecentas tolleret* (*Merc.* 75) humorously alludes to the *Lex Claudia* of 218 B.C., which forbade senators or their sons to own ships of more than 300 *amphorae* (only 5-6 tons).

## REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE

## XXXII. 2 (1958)

A. Ernout, *Les enclitiques -que et -ve*: these I.G. enclitics were first confused with and then displaced by new non-enclitic conjunctions; some anomalous uses of *-que* and *-ve* in Ovid and Horace reflect the instability of the obsolescent forms. M. Lejeune, *Essais de philologie mycénienne*: (iv) formation of privative compounds in which the second term begins with a vowel; (v) formation and usage of the dual in nouns. J. André, *Pythagorisme et botanique*: Carcopino's interpretation of *Plin. N.H.* xxii. 18-19 is scientifically unsound; *λευκάς* and *Homer's μῶλον* cannot be identified but are certainly not the same plant as *ῥοῦγγη*. R. Rémondon,

*Notes de papyrologie—la retenue de 6.50%*: from documents ranging from A.D. 138 to 338 traces the stages by which this deduction, originally a matter of banking practice, developed into a form of tax.

## XXXIII. 1 (1959)

C. Mugler, *Les théories de la vie et la conscience chez Démocrite*: life extends through the whole universe; the size of organisms in each of the habitable worlds is proportionate to its dimensions, the *μέγας διάκοσμος* grouping atoms by their affinities in size; in a particular closed cosmos the distribution of atoms is regulated by the laws of the *μικρός διάκοσμος* based on their affinities in shape. A. Ernout, *Lucretiana*: at v. 1110 and 1291 proposes *et pecua atque agros*. G. Luck, *Conjectures oubliées d'un helléniste français*: reproduces the conjectures published by Blomfield in *Museum Criticum* i (1826) from Claude Groulart's copy of *Anth. Pal.*; some are otherwise known to be by Groulart's teacher Scaliger and others may be by him; several have been made again by later scholars and accepted by editors. P. Antin, *Fortunat, Carm.* x. 6. 37: in *saecula civis* is 'citizen of eternity'; Fort. has the same expression three times elsewhere.

## RHEINISCHES MUSEUM

## CI. 2 (1958)

F. Pfister, *Dareios von Alexander getötet*: this detail was invented by the Continuator of Manetho and expresses Egyptian hatred of the Persian conquerors and enhances the glory of Alexander who was considered the son of Nectanebo and so a genuine Pharaoh. V. Pisani, *Zur lateinischen Wortgeschichte: roto*, 'wild goat', derives from \**roghōtā*; cf. *Lith. ragūotas* and Slav. *rogatī*. M. Mühl, *Des Herakles Himmelfahrt*: the saga of the Doric hero has been transformed under Oriental influences to represent the union of the blessed with god; these ideas find the most sublime expression in the Ascension of Christ. J. Knobloch, *Zur faliskischen Ceres-Inschrift*, discusses the purpose and translation of *C.I.E.* 8079. A. J. Beattie, *A Cyprian Exhortation to Sobriety*: emends, translates, and comments on H. Collitz, *S.G.D.I.* no. 68. R. Gelsomino, *Augusti epistula ad Maecenatem—Macrobius Saturn.* ii 4 12: comments word by word on this text. E. Sander, *Das Recht des römischen Soldaten* (to be concluded): makes a detailed study of the rights of Roman soldiers under the Civil Law and compares them with those of modern

German soldiers. R. Gelsomino, *Achilles a Caesare (Augusto) modo adoptato in exemplar vocatus*: so takes the quotation of *Iliad* xviii. 98-99 recorded in Appian *B.C.* iii. 13. R. Hertz, *Kaiser und Basileus im Osten*, notes Armen. *kaisr*; Modern Gk. *ὁ Κάϊςερ* (of the German Emperor).

*stereotyper Dramenschluss der Néa. Zu Menanders Dyskolos und Possidippos Apokleiomene: Dyskolos* 968-9 and P. Heid. 183 form a stereotyped end to a drama.

[For a summary of *CI.* 3 see p. 180]

## CII. 1 (1959)

R. Stark, *Zu den 'Diktyulkoi' und 'Isthmiastai' des Aischylos*: critical notes on seven passages. L. Bergson, *Episches in den Rhetorik-angelegenheiten*: concludes from a study of inflexions, diction, the use of the article, and tmesis, that the epic colouring of messenger-speeches is not the result of a deliberate imitation of Homer. H. Kuhl, *Textkritisches zu Aristoteles' περί γενέσεως καὶ φθορᾶς*: critical notes on ten passages. H. Erbse, *Zu Herodot.* at ii. 22, read *κῶς ὡς δὴτα ῥέοι ἂν ἀπὸ χύονος, ἀπὸ τῶν θερμωτάτων ἐς τὰ ψυχρότερα ῥέων; τῶν τὰ πολλά ἐστὶ, ἀνδρὶ γε λογίζεσθαι τοιούτων περὶ οἷω τε εἶναι, ὡς οὐδὲ οἰκὸς ἀπὸ χύονος μὴν ῥέειν*, and explains *ὡς* as consecutive. H. Drexler, *Potentia*: studies the usage of *potentia* and its synonyms as Roman political terms. P. Speck, *Zu Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien aus der Verschronik*: in verse 20 reads *κατεσθίων*, in verse 394 *θέε*. H. Herter, *Zum Dyskolos Menanders*: doubts the identification of the cave with the shrine of Pan and the Nymphs at Phyle. In verse 763 *π[άντ]η* alone is possible.

## CII. 2 (1959)

H. Drexler, *Iustum Bellum*: from a detailed examination of many passages in Livy evaluates the implications of the Roman ideas of *iustum bellum* and *imperium* for themselves, their allies, and conquered peoples. A. Thierfelder, *Adnotationes in Menandri Dyscolon*: critical notes on 71 passages. W. Kraus, *Zum neuen Menander*: critical notes on 56 passages; the lyrical closing scene is the most important new element in the *Dyskolos*. W. Schmid, *Menanders Dyskolos und die Timonlegende*: compares the *Dyskolos* with the Timon-legend as it appears in Lucian and Libanius. W. R. Chalmers, *An alleged Doublet in Ammianus Marcellinus*: in xxiii. 5. 7-25 and xxiv. 1. 1-5, Ammianus records events in their chronological order. E. Schwentner, *Lat. adasia*: traces the tradition of this rare word. W. G. Arnott, *Porson's Law and Middle Comedy*: refutes the statements by Snell and Wüst that Porson's Law applies to Middle Comedy. E. Vogt, *Ein*

## RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA

### N.S. XXXVI (1958): 3

(225) A. Garzya, *Euripide e Teognide*: studies certain passages in which Euripides seems to show acquaintance with poems in the Theognidean corpus, and concludes that Theognis comes second only to Solon among the lyric poets known to Euripides. (240) G. Donzelli, *Ad Diogenem Laertium vi. 26*: suggests a thorough revision of the text of the reported exchanges between Plato and Diogenes; note especially *δέκα ισχάδας* for *δὲ καὶ ισχάδας*. She also corrects the punctuation of the words *ἀλλὰ μὴν . . . ὑπεργαγῶν δὲ* in vi. 28. (249) L. Alfonsi, *Sant'Agostino, de beata vita, c. 4*: argues that the *nebulae* which confused Augustine's mind were astrological, and were derived by way of Cicero from the late works of Plato, especially the *Epinomis*. (255) S. Panciera, *'Ad libram', espressione tecnica di significato controverso*: discusses the towers made *ad libram* by Cn. Pompeius the younger for his attack on Oricus (Caes. *B.C.* iii. 40. 1) and argues that 'a livello', i.e. 'of equal height with one another and with that built by the defenders on their blockship', is the true meaning. (264) U. Cozzoli, *La Beozia durante il conflitto tra l'Ellade e la Persia*: from references to Boeotians found by Alexander the Great in Chalonitis (e.g. Diod. xvii. 110. 3 ff.) argues that the medism of the Boeotians was far from universal, and that recalcitrants were deported by the Persians in 480-79, as the Eretrians had been by Darius in 490.

### XXXVI. 4

(337) A. Luppino, *Esegesi callitulliana e callimachea*: discusses certain passages in which he thinks that the use of hyperbaton has not been understood, such as Catull. 64. 103-4 (where *non . . . frustra* should be taken together, with *ingrata tamen* as a parenthesis) and 66. 77-78 (with the corresponding lines of Callim. fr. 110 Pf.; he rejects the punctuation of Maas and Mynors, who omit the comma after *fuit* in 77); a second section is devoted to *Aetia* fr. 1. 33-35, which he thinks should be construed in the following order: *δ, πάντως, ἵνα γῆρας, ἵνα δρόσον αἰδῶ, ἦν μὲν πρῶκιον ἐκ διῆς ἥρος εἶδαρ εἶδων, αὐθι (= εἶτα) τὸ δ' ἐκδύοιμι, τό μοι*

κτλ. (350) F. Grosso, *Gli etretrici deportati in Persia*: seeks to reconcile the references in Herodotus (vi. 101) and *Anth. Pal.* (vii. 259, 256—both ascribed to Plato) with 'un curioso episodio' in Philostr. *V.A.* i. 23; he suggests that the Eretrians must have moved from Cissia to Media between the time of Plato and that of Apollonius. (376) G. Manganaro, *Novella e romanzo*: sub-titled 'a proposito di una recente pubblicazione', this, in another place, might have been called a 'review and discussion' of Q. Cataudella's *La novella greca* (Naples, 1957).

It ought perhaps to be added that the number of misprints in the *Rivista* affecting non-Italian (mainly, but not exclusively, English) names and words has increased considerably of late.

#### N.S. XXXVII (1959): I

(1) M. Untersteiner, *Aristotele Phys. 1 8-9. Frammenti del περὶ φιλοσοφίας*: dedicated to those who attended a congress of the Association Guillaume Budé at Lyons, this paper seeks to recover fragments of the dialogue *On Philosophy* from *Physics* i. 191<sup>a</sup>23-192<sup>b</sup>4. (24) G. Donzelli, *Il περὶ αἰδέσεων di Ippoboto e il κνυσμός*: seeks, by a study of the sources of Diogenes Laertius' account of the Cynics, to find an answer to the question

whether Antisthenes or Diogenes was the first Cynic; Hippobotus is worthless since his knowledge comes from Crates and Menedemus, neither of whom was well informed about the early development of Cynicism. (40) G. Bendinelli, *La civetta di Atena e l'olivo*: a contribution (illustrated by four plates) to the study of Phidian and post-Phidian art and symbolism.

#### XXXVII: 2

(113) G. Tarditi, *In margine alla cronologia di Archiloco*: a short discussion of *frr.* 22 and 19 Diehl; the *θεῶν ἐργα* in 22, 3 refer to a victory of Gyges over the Cimmerians about 660; Tarditi concludes from *fr.* 19 that Paros had not completely conquered Thasos by 650. (119) A. Barigazzi, *Note critiche al 'Dyscolos' di Menandro*: notes of varying length on nearly one hundred passages in *P.Bodmer* iv. (148) Q. Cataudella, *Note critiche al testo di Callimaco, Ermesianatte, Antagora, Alessandro Etolo*: the passages dealt with are Callim. 1. 1 Pfeiffer (read *θεῶν*), Hermes. 7. 17-18 and 61-63 Powell, Antag. 1. 1 Powell, Alex. Aet. 5. 5-8 and 8. (158) G. B. Pighi, *Emilio Macro*: a study of the evidence about Virgil's friend Macer, pointing out that he cannot be the same person as the Macer of Tibull. 2. 6. 1.

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE regional *Mittelateinisches Wörterbuch* promoted by the German Academies, with the cooperation of those of Austria and Switzerland, covering all medieval Latin texts written in German-speaking regions up to the death of Albertus Magnus in 1280, has now begun publication with its first fascicule (*a—adumen*) and a supplementary fascicule containing a list of texts and editions used. The enterprise was undertaken in 1939, on the initiative of Johannes Stroux, by the Munich and Berlin Academies, but work on it was suspended until 1948: since 1950 work has proceeded simultaneously in Munich and in Berlin. Since the death of Stroux the editorial committee has been under the presidency of Professor Paul Lehmann of Munich; Dr. Otto Prinz has been editor throughout.

At the same time the larger enterprise of the 'New Ducange', promoted by the International Union of Academies under the editorship of Professor Franz Blatt of Aarhus, which began publication with its *L* fascicule in 1957, has gone a stage farther with the appearance of a second fascicule, *Ma*.

The third (1958) volume of *Lustrum*, the successor of *Bursian*, contains three surveys: Ancient Greek Music, 1932-57 (R. P. Winnington-Ingram), Herma-goras of Temnos, 1904-55 (Dieter Matthes), and Early Latin Metre and Prosody, 1904-55 (P. W. Harsh).

We have received the first volume (1958) of *Thessalika*, 'an archaeological review for the civilisation, history and religion of Ancient Thessaly'. The editors intend to issue a yearly volume of not less than 80 pages; the annual subscription is 25s. All the contents of the first volume are in Greek, but articles in any of the major European languages will be admitted. Subscriptions and contributions should be addressed to Philarchaios Etaireia, Athanasaki 1, Volos, Greece.

Ernout and Meillet's invaluable *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine*, first published in 1932, reached its third edition, completely revised, in 1951. M. Ernout has now prepared a fourth edition; the first half has appeared and the second is to follow in 1960. The etymologies contributed by Meillet have required hardly any change, but in the rest of the work many additions and rearrangements of detail have been made and some articles have been rewritten. A number of specialized derivatives have been separated from their parent words and given articles to themselves, so that the reader no longer has to find *examen* and *exiguus* under *ago* or *exercitus* under *arceo*, and the resetting of the text in double column of clear ordinary type makes this edition more convenient to consult than its predecessor.

Three volumes of Müller's *Handbuch* which have long been out of print, Schmid-Stählin: *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vols. i (1929) and ii (1934), and Manitius: *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. i (1911), have been reissued, in photographic reprints, by the original publisher (C. H. Beck, Munich) at DM. 45, 45, and 40 (cloth) respectively. In the Teubner series Radermacher's *Quintilian* and Helm's *Apuleius*, *Apologia* and *Florida* have been reprinted with the addition of some pages of reference to later literature.

In the latest half-volume of Pauly-Wissowa (xxiii. 2) the Ptolemies (kings and astronomer) have 230 pages and the Publilii 30. There are long articles on Puteoli (Frederiksen) and Pylos (Meyer), the Pygmies (Wüst) and the Pyramids (Helck), *pseudomartyria*, *purpura*, and *puteal*: among the longer supplementary articles appended are *prodigium*, *proedros* and *prologos*, *provocatio*, and *publicatio*.

Beginning with the academical year 1959/60, the *Proceedings* of the Cambridge Philological Society will appear annually, under the editorship of Professor D. L. Page, and will include articles by members of the Society as well as papers read at its meetings. Membership of the Society is open to both libraries and individuals. Members receive the *Proceedings* and, from time to time, *Transactions*. A volume of the latter has been published, *Towards a Text of Cicero: 'Ad Atticum'*, by Dr. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Further information may be obtained from the Hon. Secretary, Mr. M. I. Finley, Jesus College, Cambridge.

Mr. T. F. Higham writes: 'In *C.R.*, vol. lxxi (March 1957), p. 17 I requested that some New Zealand scholar would confirm and amplify for future editors of Pliny *H.N.* ix. 24 ff. and Pliny *Epp.* ix. 33 a brief report printed in *The Times* of 10 March 1956 about a dolphin which allowed children at the Opononi beach to ride on its back and balanced balls, etc., on its nose.

κτλ. (350) F. Grosso, *Gli eretriesi deportati in Persia*: seeks to reconcile the references in Herodotus (vi. 101) and *Anth. Pal.* (vii. 259, 256—both ascribed to Plato) with 'un curioso episodio' in Philostr. *V.A.* i. 23; he suggests that the Eretrians must have moved from Cissia to Media between the time of Plato and that of Apollonius. (376) G. Manganaro, *Novella e romanzo*: sub-titled 'a proposito di una recente pubblicazione', this, in another place, might have been called a 'review and discussion' of Q. Cataudella's *La novella greca* (Naples, 1957).

It ought perhaps to be added that the number of misprints in the *Rivista* affecting non-Italian (mainly, but not exclusively, English) names and words has increased considerably of late.

#### N.S. XXXVII (1959): 1

(1) M. Untersteiner, *Aristotele Phys. 1 8-9. Frammenti del περί φιλοσοφίας*: dedicated to those who attended a congress of the Association Guillaume Budé at Lyons, this paper seeks to recover fragments of the dialogue *On Philosophy* from *Physics* i. 191<sup>a</sup>23-192<sup>b</sup>4. (24) G. Donzelli, *Il περί αἰρέσεων di Ippoboto e il κωνισμός*: seeks, by a study of the sources of Diogenes Laertius' account of the Cynics, to find an answer to the question

whether Antisthenes or Diogenes was the first Cynic; Hippobotus is worthless since his knowledge comes from Crates and Menedemus, neither of whom was well informed about the early development of Cynicism. (40) G. Bendinelli, *La civetta di Atena e l'oliuo*: a contribution (illustrated by four plates) to the study of Phidian and post-Phidian art and symbolism.

#### XXXVII: 2

(113) G. Tarditi, *In margine alla cronologia di Archiloco*: a short discussion of fr. 22 and 19 Diehl; the *θεῶν ἔργα* in 22. 3 refer to a victory of Gyges over the Cimmerians about 660; Tarditi concludes from fr. 19 that Paros had not completely conquered Thasos by 650. (119) A. Barigazzi, *Note critiche al 'Dyscolos' di Menandro*: notes of varying length on nearly one hundred passages in *PBodmer* iv. (148) Q. Cataudella, *Note critiche al testo di Callimaco, Ermetianatte, Antagora, Alessandro Etolo*: the passages dealt with are Callim. 1. 1 Pfeiffer (read *θέσμιος*), *Hermes*. 7. 17-18 and 61-63 Powell, *Antag.* 1. 1 Powell, *Alex. Act.* 5. 5-8 and 8. (158) G. B. Pighi, *Emilio Macro*: a study of the evidence about Virgil's friend Macer, pointing out that he cannot be the same person as the Macer of Tibull. 2. 6. 1.

## NOTES AND NEWS

THE regional *Mitellateinisches Wörterbuch* promoted by the German Academies, with the cooperation of those of Austria and Switzerland, covering all medieval Latin texts written in German-speaking regions up to the death of Albertus Magnus in 1280, has now begun publication with its first fascicule (*a—ad cumen*) and a supplementary fascicule containing a list of texts and editions used. The enterprise was undertaken in 1939, on the initiative of Johannes Stroux, by the Munich and Berlin Academies, but work on it was suspended until 1948: since 1950 work has proceeded simultaneously in Munich and in Berlin. Since the death of Stroux the editorial committee has been under the presidency of Professor Paul Lehmann of Munich; Dr. Otto Prinz has been editor throughout.

At the same time the larger enterprise of the 'New Ducange', promoted by the International Union of Academies under the editorship of Professor Franz Blatt of Aarhus, which began publication with its *L* fascicule in 1957, has gone a stage farther with the appearance of a second fascicule, *Ma*.

The third (1958) volume of *Lustrum*, the successor of *Bursian*, contains three surveys: Ancient Greek Music, 1932-57 (R. P. Winnington-Ingram), Herma-goras of Temnos, 1904-55 (Dieter Matthes), and Early Latin Metre and Prosody, 1904-55 (P. W. Harsh).

We have received the first volume (1958) of *Thessalika*, 'an archaeological review for the civilisation, history and religion of Ancient Thessaly'. The editors intend to issue a yearly volume of not less than 80 pages; the annual subscription is 25s. All the contents of the first volume are in Greek, but articles in any of the major European languages will be admitted. Subscriptions and contributions should be addressed to Philarchaios Etaireia, Athanasaki 1, Volos, Greece.

Ernout and Meillet's invaluable *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Latine*, first published in 1932, reached its third edition, completely revised, in 1951. M. Ernout has now prepared a fourth edition; the first half has appeared and the second is to follow in 1960. The etymologies contributed by Meillet have required hardly any change, but in the rest of the work many additions and rearrangements of detail have been made and some articles have been rewritten. A number of specialized derivatives have been separated from their parent words and given articles to themselves, so that the reader no longer has to find *examen* and *exiguus* under *ago* or *exercitus* under *arceo*, and the resetting of the text in double column of clear ordinary type makes this edition more convenient to consult than its predecessor.

Three volumes of Müller's Handbuch which have long been out of print, Schmid-Stählin: *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*, vols. i (1929) and ii (1934), and Manitius: *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*, vol. i (1911), have been reissued, in photographic reprints, by the original publisher (C. H. Beck, Munich) at DM. 45, 45, and 40 (cloth) respectively. In the Teubner series Radermacher's *Quintilian* and Helm's *Apuleius*, *Apologia* and *Florida* have been reprinted with the addition of some pages of reference to later literature.

In the latest half-volume of Pauly-Wissowa (xxiii. 2) the Ptolemies (kings and astronomer) have 230 pages and the Publilii 30. There are long articles on Puteoli (Frederiksen) and Pylos (Meyer), the Pygmies (Wüst) and the Pyramids (Helck), *pseudomartyria*, *purpura*, and *puteal*: among the longer supplementary articles appended are *prodigium*, *proedros* and *prologos*, *provocatio*, and *publicatio*.

Beginning with the academical year 1959/60, the *Proceedings* of the Cambridge Philological Society will appear annually, under the editorship of Professor D. L. Page, and will include articles by members of the Society as well as papers read at its meetings. Membership of the Society is open to both libraries and individuals. Members receive the *Proceedings* and, from time to time, *Transactions*. A volume of the latter has been published, *Towards a Text of Cicero: 'Ad Atticum'*, by Dr. D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Further information may be obtained from the Hon. Secretary, Mr. M. I. Finley, Jesus College, Cambridge.

Mr. T. F. Higham writes: 'In *C.R.*, vol. lxxi (March 1957), p. 17 I requested that some New Zealand scholar would confirm and amplify for future editors of Pliny *H.N.* ix. 24 ff. and Pliny *Epp.* ix. 33 a brief report printed in *The Times* of 10 March 1956 about a dolphin which allowed children at the Opononi beach to ride on its back and balanced balls, etc., on its nose.



The responses to this request—one from Mr. L. G. Pocock, formerly Professor of Classics in Canterbury University College, and one from Professor H. A. Murray of Victoria University College—will be found in an article, illustrated by photographs, to be printed in the March 1960 number of *Greece & Rome* under the title "Nature Note: Dolphin Riders. Ancient Stories vindicated".

## BOOKS RECEIVED

*Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.*

- Adriani (A.)** *Divagazioni intorno ad una coppa paesistica del Museo di Alessandria.* (Documenti e Ricerche d'Arte Alessandrina, iii-iv.) Pp. vii+85; 58 plates. Rome: Bretschneider, 1959. Paper, L. 10,000.
- André (J.)** *Notes de lexicographie botanique grecque.* Pp. 77. Paris: Champion, 1958. Paper.
- Atti del Convegno Internazionale Ovidiano,** Sulmona, Maggio 1958. 2 volumes. Pp. 289, 420. Rome: Istituto di Studi Romani, 1959. Paper, L. 5,000.
- Bailey (S. K.)** *Roman Life and Letters: a Reader for the Sixth Form.* With notes and vocabulary. Pp. x+195. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Barbu (N. I.)** *Aspecte din viața romană în scrisorile lui Cicero.* Pp. 197. Bucarest: Editura Academiei Republicii Populare Romine, 1959. Cloth, lei 16.80.
- Blomgren (S.)** *Eine Echtheitsfrage bei Optatus von Mileve.* (Acta Acad. Reg. Scient. Upsaliensis, 5.) Pp. 71. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1959. Paper, kr. 10.
- Böhme (R.)** *Von Sokrates zur Ideenlehre: Beobachtungen zur Chronologie des platonischen Frühwerks.* (Dissertationes Bernenses, ser. i, fasc. 9.) Pp. 158. Bern: Francke, 1959. Paper, 18.50 Sw. fr.
- Bona (G.)** *Il νόος e i νόοι nell'Odissea.* (Univ. di Torino, Pubbl. della Fac. di Lett., xi. 1.) Pp. 67. Turin: Università, 1959. Paper, L. 700.
- Bonnard (A.)** *Greek Civilization from the Antigone to Socrates.* Translated by A. L. Sells. Pp. 248; 64 plates. London: Allen & Unwin, 1959. Cloth, 30s. net.
- British School at Rome.** *Papers: Volume xxvi (1958).* Pp. 217; 37 plates. London: British School at Rome, 1959. Cloth, £2. 10s. net.
- Brouwer (R. A.) (ed.)** *On Translation.* (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature, No. 23.) Pp. xi+297. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 52s. net.
- Classen (G. J.)** *Sprachliche Deutung als Triebkraft platonischen und sokratischen Philosophierens.* (Zetemata, 22.) Pp. xii+187. Munich: Beck, 1959. Paper, DM. 22.
- Clausen (W. V.)** *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae.* (Oxford Classical Texts.) Pp. xiv+198. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Cohen (M. R.), Drabkin (I. E.)** *A Source Book in Greek Science.* Pp. xxi+581. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 60s. net.
- Cooper (C. G.)** *Journey to Hesperia. Scenes from Aeneid i-vi linked by English narrative and edited with introduction, notes, appendixes, and vocabulary.* Pp. xlii+189; ill. London: Macmillan, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Corbett (P. B.)** *The Latin of the Regula Magistri with particular reference to its colloquial aspects.* (Univ. de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, iv<sup>e</sup> série, fasc. 17.) Pp. 308. Louvain: Éditions Nauwelaerts, 1958. Paper, 320 B. fr.
- Corbett (P. E.)** *The Sculptures of the Parthenon.* (King Penguin Books.) Pp. 39; 40 plates. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1959. Boards, 5s. net.
- Couch (H. N.)** *Cicero on the Art of Growing Old. A translation and subjective evaluation of the essay entitled Cato the Elder on Old Age.* Pp. xv+112. Providence, R. I.: Brown University Press (Ilfracombe: A. H. Stockwell, Ltd.), 1959. Cloth, \$2.
- Crossman (R. H. S.)** *Plato Today.* Revised edition. Pp. 215. London: Allen and Unwin, 1959. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Daube (D.) (ed.)** *Studies in the Roman Law of Sale dedicated to the memory of Francis de Zulueta.* Pp. xi+195. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1959. Cloth, 25s. net.
- De Lacy (P. H.), Einarson (B.)** *Plutarch:*

- Moralia. Vol. vii. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xvi+618. London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Deonna (W.) Mercure et le Scorpion. (Collection Latomus, xxxvii.) Pp. 50. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 75 B. fr.
- Dörrie (H.) Porphyrios' 'Symmiktá Zetemata'. Ihre Stellung in System und Geschichte des Neuplatonismus nebst einem Kommentar zu den Fragmenten. (Zetemata, 20.) Pp. xiii+236. Munich: Beck, 1959. Paper, DM. 22.50.
- Duplacy (J.) Où en est la critique textuelle du Nouveau Testament? Pp. 112. Paris: Gabalda, 1959. Paper, 730 fr.
- Durand (F.) La poesia di Orazio. Pp. 175. Turin: Loescher, 1959. Paper, L. 1,000.
- Edmonds (J. M.) The Fragments of Attic Comedy. Volume ii. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Cloth, fl. 70.
- Ernout (A.) Pline l'Ancien: Histoire Naturelle, livre xxvii. Texte établi, traduit et commenté. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 122 (partly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper.
- Ernout (A.), Meillet (A.) Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Quatrième édition revue et corrigée. Tome i. Pp. xviii+400. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959. Paper, 6,000 fr.
- Fehrle (E.), Hünnerkopf (R.) P. Cornelius Tacitus: Germania. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit Erläuterungen versehen. 5. überarbeitete Auflage. Pp. 144; 8 plates, map. Heidelberg: Winter, 1959. Paper, DM. 10.80.
- Festugière (A. J.) Antioche païenne et chrétienne: Libanius, Chrysostome et les moines de Syrie. (Bibl. des Éc. Franç. d'Ath. et de Rome, fasc. 194.) Pp. 540; 3 plates. Paris: De Boccard, 1959. Paper, 3,500 fr.
- Galiano (M. F.), Lasso de la Vega (J. S.), Adrados (F. R.) El Descubrimiento del Amor en Grecia. Seis conferencias. Pp. 232. Madrid: Universidad, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, 1959. Paper.
- Henry (P.), Schwyzer (H. R.) Plotini opera. Tomus ii: Enneades iv-v. Pp. liv+504. Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1959. Cloth, 400 B. fr.
- Herrmann (H. V.) Omphalos. (Orbis Antiquus, 13.) Pp. 124; 12 plates, 7 figs. Münster: Aschendorff, 1959. Paper, DM. 9.80.
- Heubeck (A.) Lydiaka: Untersuchungen zu Schrift, Sprache und Götternamen der Lyden. (Erlanger Forschungen, Reihe A, Bd. 9.) Pp. 88. Erlangen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1959. Paper, DM. 8.
- Hight (G. A.) Poets in a Landscape. Pp. 270; 48 plates. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1959. Paper, 6s. net. [First published 1957.]
- Hinshelwood (C. N.) Classics among the Intellectual Disciplines. (Classical Association, Presidential Address, 1959.) Pp. 16. London: Murray, 1959. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Hoogma (R. P.) Der Einfluss Vergils auf die Carmina Latina Epigraphica. Eine Studie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der metrisch-technischen Grundsätze der Entlehnung. Pp. xxiii+373. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1959. Paper, 60s.
- Humbert (J.), Gernet (L.) Démosthène: Plaidoyers Politiques. Tome ii: Contre Midias, Contre Aristocrate. Texte établi et traduit. (Collection Budé.) Pp. 196 (mostly double). Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper.
- Johansen (H. F.) General Reflection in Tragic Rhesis: a study of form. Pp. 198. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959. Paper, kr. 30.
- Kammerbeek (J. C.) The Plays of Sophocles: Commentaries. ii: The Trachiniae. Pp. 256. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Cloth, fl. 46.
- Kauer (S.) Die Geburt der Athena im altgriechischen Epos. Pp. 63. Würzburg: Triltsch, 1959. Paper, DM. 4.80.
- Kennedy (E. C.) Caesar: De Bello Gallico, Books iii and vii. With introduction, notes, and vocabulary. Pp. 107, 224. Cambridge: University Press, 1959. Boards, 6s. net each.
- Kesters (H.) Plaidoyer d'un socratique contre le Phèdre de Platon: xxvi<sup>e</sup> Discours de Thémistius. Pp. xv+296. Louvain: Éditions Nauwelaerts, 1959. Paper, 290 B. fr.
- Kiefner (W.) Der religiöse Allbegriff des Aischylos: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung von *πάν*, *πάντα*, *πάντες* u.s.w. als Ausdrucksmittel religiöser Sprache. (Tübingen diss.) Pp. 138. Obtainable from the author at Hauffstrasse 7, Tübingen.
- Klingner (F.) Q. Horati Flacci Opera. Tertium recogn. F. K. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxv+378. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Boards, DM. 17.
- Knox (R. A.) In Three Tongues. Pp. xiv+168. London: Chapman and Hall, 1959. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Körte (A.) Menandri Reliquiae. Pars ii: Reliquiae apud veteres scriptores servatae. Opus postumum retractavit, addenda ad utramque partem adiecit A. Thierfelder. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xvi+398. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Boards, DM. 16.60.

- Kraner* (F.), *Hofmann* (F.), *Meusel* (H.) C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de Bello Civili. Erklärt von F. K. und F. H.; zwölfte Auflage von H. M.; Nachwort und bibliographische Nachträge von Hans Oppermann. Pp. xvi+425. Berlin: Weidmann, 1959. Cloth DM. 33.
- Lewis* (N.) Samothrace. Vol. i: The Ancient Literary Sources. (Bollingen Series, xl. 1.) Pp. xv+148. New York: Pantheon Books, 1959. Cloth, \$7.50.
- Löfstedt* (E.) Late Latin. (Institutet for Sammenlignende Kulturforskning, ser. A, vol. xxv.) Pp. 210. Oslo: Aschehoug (London: Kegan Paul), 1959. Paper, N. kr. 25.
- Maddalena* (A.) Sofocle. Pp. 419. Turin: Edizioni di 'Filosofia', 1959. Paper, L. 3,000.
- Mattes* (W.) Odysseus bei den Phäaken. Kritisches zur Homeranalyse. Pp. 171. Würzburg: Trilsch, 1958. Paper, DM. 6.
- Maule* (Q. F.), *Smith* (H. R. W.) Votive Religion at Caere: Prolegomena. (Publ. in Class. Archaeology, vol. 4, No. 1.) Pp. 136; 5 plates, 8 figs. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959. Paper, \$3.
- Michalowski* (K.) Delfy. Pp. 229; 106 figs. Warsaw: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1959. Cloth, zł. 40.
- Mireaux* (E.) Daily Life in the Time of Homer. English Translation by I. Sells. Pp. 264. London: Allen and Unwin, 1959. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch* bis zum ausgehenden 13. Jahrhundert. Herausgegeben von der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Band i, Lieferung 1 (a—adcumen): Pp. vii+80. Sonderlieferung (Abkürzungs- und Quellenverzeichnisse): Pp. 94. Munich: Beck, 1959. Paper, DM. 15, 18.
- Morau* (P.) Une imprécation funéraire à Néocésarée. (Bibl. Arch. et Hist. de l'Inst. Français d'Istanbul, iv.) Pp. 56; 4 plates. Paris: Maisonneuve, 1959. Paper.
- Morris* (S.) Advanced Latin Tests. Pp. 141. London: Harrap, 1959. Cloth, 6s.
- Müller* (G.) Die Darstellung der Kinetik bei Lucrez. Pp. 130. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959. Paper, DM. 15.50.
- Mugler* (C.) Dictionnaire historique de la terminologie géométrique des Grecs. 2 vols. (Études et Commentaires, xxviii, xxix.) Pp. 456. Paris: Klincksieck, 1959. Paper, 22,000 fr.
- Murray* (R. D.) The Motif of Io in Aeschylus' Suppliants. Pp. xi+104. Princeton, N.J.: University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 16s. net.
- Mutschmann* (H.), *Mau* (I.) Sexti Empirici opera. Vol. i *Πυρρῶν ἐν Ὑπομνησίων* libros tres continens. Rec. H. M.: edit. stereotypam emendatam curavit, addenda et corrigenda adiecit I. M. (Scr. Gr. et Rom. Bibl. Teubneriana.) Pp. xxxiii+221. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth and boards, DM. 11.70.
- Noe* (S. P.) The Coinage of Caulonia. (Numismatic Studies, No. 9.) Pp. 62; 18 plates. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1959. Paper, \$5.
- Novum Glossarium Mediae Latinitatis* ab anno dcccc usque ad annum mcc. Edendum curavit Consilium Academicum Consociatarum. *Ma*. Pp. 278. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1959. Paper, kr. 40.
- O'Meara* (J. J.) Porphyry's Philosophy from Oracles in Augustine. Pp. 184. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1959. Paper.
- Opstellen* (J. C.) Beschouwingen naar Aanleiding van het Ontbreken van ons ethisch Wilsbegrip in de oud-griekse Ethiek. (Medd. der K. Ned. Akad. van Wetens., Afd. Letterkunde, N.R., Deel 22, No. 1.) Pp. 66. Amsterdam: Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Mij., 1959. Paper, fl. 4.
- Paap* (A. H. R. E.) Nomina Sacra in the Greek Papyri of the first five centuries A.D. (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, viii.) Pp. 127. Leiden: Brill, 1959. Paper, fl. 40.
- Palm* (J.) Rom, Römertum und Imperium in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit. (Skr. utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Lund, lvii.) Pp. 136. Lund: Gleerup, 1959. Paper, kr. 15.
- Paribene* (E.) Catalogo delle sculture di Cirene: statue e rilievi di carattere religioso. (Monografie di Archeologia Libica, v.) Pp. x+168; 209 plates. Rome: Bretschneider, 1959. Paper, L. 18,000.
- Patzig* (G.) Die aristotelische Syllogistik. (Abh. d. Akad. d. Wiss. in Göttingen, phil.-hist. Kl., 3. Folge, Nr. 42.) Pp. 206. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. Paper, DM. 19.80.
- Pavano* (G.) Introduzione alla lingua etrusca e saggio di traduzione. Pp. 82. Turin: Gheroni, 1959. Paper.
- Popp* (H.) Die Einwirkung von Vorzeichen, Opfern und Festen auf die Kriegführung der Griechen im 5. und 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr. Pp. 144. Erlangen: Rudolf Merkel, 1959. Paper, DM. 12.
- Quiring* (H.) Heraklit. Pp. 164. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1959. Cloth, DM. 18.
- Radermacher* (L.) Quintilianus: Institutio Oratoria. Editio stereotypa correctior

- editionis primae; addenda et corrigenda collegit et adiecit V. Buchheit. 2 vols. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. xii+365, xii+458. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth, DM. 12, 15.
- Ramoux (C.) *La nuit et les enfants de la nuit de la tradition grecque*. Pp. 275. Paris: Flammarion, 1959. Paper, 950 fr.
- Ramoux (C.) *Vocabulaire et structures de pensée archaïque chez Héraclite*. Pp. 501. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1959. Paper.
- Renard (M.) *Technique et agriculture en pays trévire et rémois*. (Collection Latomus, xxxviii.) Pp. 72; 9 fig., 7 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 100 B. fr.
- Richter (G. M. A.) *A Handbook of Greek Art*. Pp. ix+421; 500 ill. London: Phaidon Press, 1959. Cloth, 37s. 6d. net.
- Richter (G. M. A.) *Attic Red-Figured Vases*. Revised edition. Pp. xxvii+209. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 40s. net.
- Richter (G. M. A.) *Greek Portraits, ii: To what extent were they faithful likenesses?* (Collection Latomus, xxxvi.) Pp. 48; 16 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 100 B. fr.
- Robinson (C. W.) *The Antigone of Sophocles translated into English Verse*. Pp. viii+72. New York: privately printed, 1959. Stiff paper.
- Robinson (H. S.) *The Athenian Agora*. Volume v: *Pottery of the Roman Period*. Pp. xiv+149; 76 plates. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1959. Cloth, \$12.50.
- Rose (H. J.) *Religion in Greece and Rome*. (Harper Torchbooks, 55.) Pp. xiv+312. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. Stiff paper, \$1.60. [Originally published as *Ancient Greek Religion* (1946) and *Ancient Roman Religion* (1948).]
- Sartori (G.) *Hellenistic Science and Culture in the last three centuries B.C.* Pp. xxvi+554. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Schlesinger (A. C.) *Livy*. Vol. xiv: *Summaries, Fragments, General Index*. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. x+557; maps. London: Heinemann, 1959. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Schmid (W.) *Über die klassische Theorie und Praxis des antiken Prosarhythmus*. (Hermes Einzelschriften, 12.) Pp. viii+203. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1959. Paper, DM. 20.
- Schmidt (M.) *Vergil: Die Mücke*. Lateinisch und deutsch. Pp. 47. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1959. Paper, DM. 6.
- Scholfeld (A. F.) *Aelian: On Animals*. With an English translation. (Loeb Classical Library.) Volume ii (Books vi-xi). Pp. 413. London: Heinemann, 1958. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Schwartz (E.) *Gesammelte Schriften*. Band 3.: *Zur Geschichte des Athanasius*. Pp. xii+330. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1959. Cloth, DM. 42.
- Scullard (H. H.) *From the Gracchi to Nero*. A History of Rome from 133 B.C. to A.D. 68. Pp. xi+450. London: Methuen, 1959. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Snell (B.) *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. Editio tertia. Pars i: *Epinicia*. (Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. x+190. Leipzig: Teubner, 1959. Cloth, DM. 7.80.
- Snell (B.), Fleischer (U.), Mette (H. J.) *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Lieferung 3.: αἰρέω—ἀλλά. Pp. 158. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959. Paper, DM. 24.
- Speyer (W.) *Naucellius und sein Kreis*. Studien zu den Epigrammata Bobiensia. (Zetemata, 21.) Pp. viii+128. Munich: Beck, 1959. Paper, DM. 18.
- Stein (F. J.) *Dexippus et Herodianus rerum scriptores quatenus Thucydidem secuti sint*. (Bonn diss.) Pp. 221. Bonn: privately printed, 1957. Paper.
- Steven (S. J. H.), Viljoen (G. van N.) *Cicero: Student and Statesman*. Two papers read at Pretoria, 23 August 1958. Pp. 34. Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1959. Paper.
- Thieman (E.) *Hellenistische Vatergottheiten*. Das Bild des bärtigen Gottes in der nachklassischen Kunst. (Orbis Antiquus, 14.) Pp. 144; 8 plates. Münster: Aschendorff, 1959. Paper, DM. 9.80.
- Thumb (A.) *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*. Band ii, mit einem Anhang über das Mykenische. 2. stark verbesserte und erweiterte Auflage von A. Scherer. Pp. xv+436. Heidelberg: Winter, 1959. Paper, DM. 32.
- Toynbee (A. J.) *Hellenism: the History of a Civilization*. (Home University Library.) Pp. xi+255; 3 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Toynbee (A. J.), Myers (E. D.) *Historical Atlas and Gazetteer*. (A Study of History, Vol. xi.) Pp. 257. London: Oxford University Press, 1959. Cloth, 35s. net.
- Tsonchev (D.) *Monuments de la sculpture romaine en Bulgarie méridionale*. (Collection Latomus, xxxix.) Pp. 41; 24 plates. Brussels: Latomus, 1959. Paper, 100 B. fr.
- Vian (F.) *Histoire de la tradition manuscrite de Quintus de Smyrne*. (Publ. de la

- Fac. des Lettres de l'Univ. de Clermont, 2<sup>e</sup> sér., fasc. vii.) Pp. 131; 4 plates. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1959. Paper.
- Wallach (L.) Alcuin and Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History and Literature. Pp. x+325. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1959. Cloth, \$6.50.
- Wehrli (F.) Die Schule des Aristoteles: Texte und Kommentar. Heft x: Hieronymos von Rhodos, Kritolaos und seine Schüler; Rückblick: Der Peripatos in vorchristlicher Zeit; Register. Pp. 200. Basel: Schwabe, 1959. Paper, 32 Sw. fr.
- Weiss (J.) Earliest Christianity: a History of the Period A.D. 30-150. 2 vols. (Harper Torchbooks, 53, 54.) Pp. xxx+870. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1959. Paper, \$1.95, 2.25. [Reprint of *The History of Primitive Christianity* (1937), with a new introduction and bibliography by F. C. Grant.]
- Weitzmann (K.) Ancient Book Illumination. (Martin Classical Lectures, xvi.) Pp. xiv+166; 64 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1959. Cloth, 72s. net.
- Westerink (L. G.) Damascius: Lectures on the Philebus. Pp. xxii+149. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1959. Cloth, 45s.
- Wilkinson (L. P.) Letters of Cicero. A selection in translation. Pp. 253; 3 maps. London: Arrow Books, 1959. Paper, 3s. net. [First published 1949; see C.R. lxx. 36.]

# THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

EDITED BY  
C. J. FORDYCE  
AND  
R. M. RATTENBURY

## BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (*Chairman*)  
PROF. R. G. AUSTIN (*Hon. Treasurer*)  
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.  
PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A., F.B.A.  
PROF. W. S. WATT, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*)  
A. G. WOODHEAD, M.A. (*Representing the Cambridge Philological Society*)  
M. PLATNAUER, B.Litt., M.A. (*Representing the Oxford Philological Society*)

## *With the co-operation of*

PROF. B. D. MERITT, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton  
PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, University of Adelaide, and  
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, Institute of Advanced Study, Princeton

## NEW SERIES

## VOLUME IX

(VOL. LXXIII OF THE CONTINUOUS SERIES)

*Published in co-operation with the Classical Association*  
OXFORD: AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1959



*Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C.4*

GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON  
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI KUALA LUMPUR  
CAPE TOWN IBADAN NAIROBI ACCRA

© *Oxford University Press 1959*

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Number 1

Theognis, 257-66	J. A. DAVISON	I
Epigrams by Theaetetus and Thymocles	A. S. F. GOW	5
<i>Contaminatio</i>	W. BEARE	7
An unnoticed Pindaric fragment	D. S. ROBERTSON	11
Sophocles, <i>Antigone</i> 897-902	D. B. GREGOR	12
The βαίτη at Mantinea	A. J. GOSSAGE	12
Cicero and the 'Lex Campana'	T. A. DOREY	13

### REVIEWS:

*Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* (Hamm), D. L. PAGE, 14; *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, xxiv, D. L. PAGE, 15; *Aeschylus, Agamemnon* (Denniston and Page), *Der Agamemnon des Aeschylus* (Fraenkel), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 23; *Anthologie Grecque*, tome vii (Waltz-Soury), A. S. F. GOW, 26; *Socrates, Man and Myth* (Chroust), G. B. KERFERD, 27; *Aristotle's Theory of Contrariety* (Anton), G. B. KERFERD, 30; *Procli Hymni* (Vogt), A. H. ARMSTRONG, 31; *Horace* (Fraenkel), L. P. WILKINSON, 32; *Virgil, The Aeneid* (Oakley), R. G. AUSTIN, 37; *Ovidi Ibis* (La Penna), E. J. KENNEY, 38; *Varronische Studien*, i (Dahlmann-Heisterhagen), E. LAUGHTON, 41; *Römische Literaturgeschichte* (Büchner), R. BROWNING, 42; *Latin Verse and European Song* (Beare), R. BROWNING, 45; *Humanitas Romana* (Büchner), M. L. CLARKE, 49; *The Intellectual Heritage of the Early Middle Ages* (Laistner), R. R. BOLGAR, 51; *Ancient and Oriental Music* (Wellesz), E. K. BORTHWICK, 53; *Hēphaistos* (Delcourt), H. J. ROSE, 55; *The Dionysiac Mysteries of the Hellenistic and Roman Age* (Nilsson), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 57; *La Ionia nel mondo miceneo* (Cassola), F. H. STUBBINGS, 59; *Athenian Democracy* (Jones), A. R. W. HARRISON, 60; *Pyrrhos* (Lévéque), H. H. SCULLARD, 62; *Rom und Rhodos* (Schmitt), P. M. FRASER, 64; *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, i (Tcherikover-Fuks), E. G. TURNER, 67; *Nero* (Walter), P. J. CUFF, 69; *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, xxv, J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 70.

Short Reviews	72
Summaries of Periodicals	89
Notes and News	91
Books Received	92

## Number 2

Dogs and Leather	G. W. WILLIAMS	97
Callimachus, fr. 567 Pfeiffer	E. A. BARBER	101
Columella, <i>R.R.</i> vii. 3. 7 and 15	W. D. ASHWORTH	102
The <i>Domitius</i> of Curiatius Maternus	H. B. MATTINGLY	104
Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i> 1389 f.	W. L. LORIMER	108
Menander, fr. 416 Körte	G. ZUNTZ	108
Plato, <i>Laws</i> 704a-707c, and Thucydides, ii. 35-46	C. MACDONALD	108
Sallustiana	W. A. CAMPS	109

### REVIEWS:

*L'élément achéen dans la langue épique* (Ruijgh), A. J. BEATTIE, 110; *Strophengestaltung in der griechischen Tragödie*, i (Kraus), L. P. E. PARKER, 113; *Euripides, Interpretationen zur dramatischen Form* (Strohm), P. T. STEVENS, 115; *Démosthène, Plaidoyers civils*, ii (Gernet), J. H. KELS, 117; *The Presocratic Philosophers* (Kirk and Raven), G. B. KERFERD, 119; *La méthode ontologique de Platon* (Vanhouette), J. R. TREVASKIS, 122; *Aristotle's Protrepticus* (Rabinowitz), D. J. ALLAN, 124; *A la recherche de l'Aristote perdu* (Moraux), D. J. ALLAN, 127; *Aristotle in the ancient biographical tradition* (Düring), G. B. KERFERD, 128; *Phainias von Eresos* (Wehrli), G. B. KERFERD, 130; *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 5, 6 (Frisk), D. M. JONES, 131; *Rückläufiges Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen* (Dornseiff-Hansen), J. CHADWICK, 133; *Le polythéisme et l'emploi des mots θεός, δαίμων* (François), W. K. C. GUTHRIE, 135; *Storia del teatro latino* (Paratore), E. W. HANDLEY, 136; *Horatius, Satiren* (Kiessling-Heinze-Burck), L. P. WILKINSON, 139; *Aufbau und*

*Absicht von Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum* (Leeman), D. A. MALCOLM, 140; *Cicéron traducteur de Platon* (Poncelet), F. H. SANDBACH, 142; *Die Konzessivität bei Livius* (Mikkola), A. H. McDONALD, 144; *Plin, Histoire Naturelle*, xxvi (Ernout-Pépin), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 146; *Marco Aurelio Latino* (Pepe), R. BROWNING, 148; *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics* (Havelock), P. A. BRUNT, 149; *La Loi navale de Thémistocle* (Labarbe), A. R. W. HARRISON, 153; *The Indo-Greeks* (Narain), E. D. PHILLIPS, 155; *Inscriptiones latinae liberae reipublicae*, i (Degrassi), J. M. REYNOLDS, 156; *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzahl* (Perl), E. S. STAVELEY, 158; *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Rostovtzeff), R. MEIGGS, 160; *Princeps Iudex* (Kelly), J. A. CROOK, 161; *Le culte des souverains* (Cerfaux-Tondriau), E. G. TURNER, 164; *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones* (Fraser and Rönne), A. G. WOODHEAD, 166; *The Athenian Agora*, iii (Wycherley), A. G. WOODHEAD, 167.

Short Reviews	169
Summaries of Periodicals	180
Books Received	181
Preliminary Notes on Menander's <i>Dyskolos</i>	H. LLOYD-JONES 183

### Number 3

The Sources of Stesichorus, fr. 74 (B.) and Sappho, fr. 2. 5 (L.-P.)	
	D. L. PAGE 193
Pindar, <i>Olympian Odes</i> 6. 82-86	K. J. DOVER 194
Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i> 11-20	K. J. DOVER 196
The Hoopoe's Song (Arist. <i>Birds</i> 227 ff.)	A. M. DALE 199
Seven Emendations	D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY 200
Two notes on the <i>Satires</i> of Horace	J. H. KELLs 202
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i> 986	R. E. WYCHERLEY 205
Himerius and Athena	W. H. PLOMMER 206
Lucretius iii. 961-2	K. F. C. ROSE 207
Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> i. 32	D. S. ROBERTSON 208

#### REVIEWS:

*Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, W. K. C. GUTHRIE, J. M. C. TOYNBEE, D. M. JONES, 208; *The Mycenae Tablets*, ii (Bennett), *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos* (Bennett), A. J. BEATTIE, 213; *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* (Lejeune), A. J. BEATTIE, 221; *The Decipherment of Linear B* (Chadwick), D. M. JONES, 222; *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Landau), D. M. JONES, 225; *From Mycenae to Homer* (Webster), *Homer and the Homeric Tradition* (Whitman), J. A. DAVISON, 227; *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Thummer), H. J. ROSE, 231; *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Radt), H. T. DEAS, 233; *Anacreon* (Gentili), D. L. PAGE, 234; *Safo* (Galiano), D. L. PAGE, 238; *Aeschylus* (Weir Smyth, Lloyd-Jones), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 239; *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Stanford), D. MERVYN JONES, 242; *Callimachus* (Trypanis), H. LLOYD-JONES, 244; *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. xii (Cherniss, Helmbold), D. A. RUSSELL, 246; *Aelian, On Animals* vol. i (Scholfield), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 247; *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Brown), H. D. WESTLAKE, 249; *Order and History*, ii, iii (Voegelin), G. B. KERFERD, 251; *Aristotle's Poetics* (Else), *Aristotle on Poetry and Style* (Grube), D. W. LUCAS, 252; *Ovidius, Die Fasten* (Bömer), E. J. KENNEY, 255; *Tacitus* (Syme), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 258; *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Hagendahl), S. L. GREENSLADE, 262; *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Mohrmann), R. BROWNING, 263; *Le clerico nella vita politica ateniese* (Sartori), R. J. HOPPER, 266; *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Adcock), R. J. HOPPER, 268; *Dionysios I* (Strohacker), H. D. WESTLAKE, 269; *Rome et Véies* (Hubaux), H. J. ROSE, 271; *Appiani bellorum civilium liber i* (Gabba), E. BADIEN, 272; *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 B.C.* (Badian), H. H. SCULLARD, 274; *Roman History from Coins* (Grant), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 277; *Troy, Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII* (Blegen and others), F. H. STUBBINGS, 278; *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden* (Plekett), A. M. WOODWARD, 280; *Iconografia romana imperiale, 222-285 d.C.* (Felletti Maj), J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 281; *D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson* (Thompson), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 283.

Short Reviews	284
Summaries of Periodicals	305
Notes and News	308
Books Received	310
Indexes	315

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

*Poetics* (Else), *Aristotle on Poetry and Style* (Grube), D. W. LUCAS, 252; *Ovidius, Die Fasten* (Bömer), E. J. KENNEY, 255; *Tacitus* (Syme), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 258; *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Hagendahl), S. L. GREENSLADE, 262; *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Mohrmann), R. BROWNING, 263; *Le clerico nella vita politica ateniese* (Sartori), R. J. HOPPER, 266; *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Adcock), R. J. HOPPER, 268; *Dionysius I* (Stroheker), H. D. WESTLAKE, 269; *Rome et Vêies* (Hubaux), H. J. ROSE, 271; *Appiani bellorum civilium liber i* (Gabba), E. BADIAN, 272; *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 B.C.* (Badian), H. H. SCULLARD, 274; *Roman History from Coins* (Grant), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 277; *Troy, Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII* (Blegen and others), F. H. STUBBINGS, 278; *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden* (Pleket), A. M. WOODWARD, 280; *Iconografia romana imperiale, 222-285 d. C.* (Felletti Maj), J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 281; *D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson* (Thompson), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 283.

Short Reviews	284
Summaries of Periodicals	305
Notes and News	308
Books Received	310
Indexes	315

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.

*Absicht von Sallusts Bellum Jugurthinum* (Leeman), D. A. MALCOLM, 140; *Cicéron traducteur de Platon* (Poncelet), F. H. SANDBACH, 142; *Die Konzessivität bei Livius* (Mikkola), A. H. McDONALD, 144; *Pline, Histoire Naturelle*, xxvi (Ernout-Pépin), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 146; *Marco Aurelio Latino* (Pepe), R. BROWNING, 148; *The Liberal Temper in Greek Politics* (Havelock), P. A. BRUNT, 149; *La Loi navale de Thémistocle* (Labarbe), A. R. W. HARRISON, 153; *The Indo-Greeks* (Narain), E. D. PHILLIPS, 155; *Inscriptiones latinae liberae reipublicae*, i (Degrassi), J. M. REYNOLDS, 156; *Kritische Untersuchungen zu Diodors römischer Jahrzahl* (Perl), E. S. STAVELEY, 158; *The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire* (Rostovtzeff), R. MEIGGS, 160; *Princeps Iudex* (Kelly), J. A. CROOK, 161; *Le culte des souverains* (Cerafoux-Tondriaux), E. G. TURNER, 164; *Boeotian and West Greek Tombstones* (Fraser and Rönne), A. G. WOODHEAD, 166; *The Athenian Agora*, iii (Wycherley), A. G. WOODHEAD, 167.

Short Reviews	169
Summaries of Periodicals	180
Books Received	181
Preliminary Notes on Menander's <i>Dyskolos</i>	H. LLOYD-JONES 183

### Number 3

The Sources of Stesichorus, fr. 74 (B.) and Sappho, fr. 2. 5 (L.-P.)	D. L. PAGE 193
Pindar, <i>Olympian Odes</i> 6. 82-86	K. J. DOVER 194
Aristophanes, <i>Knights</i> 11-20	K. J. DOVER 196
The Hoopoe's Song (Arist. <i>Birds</i> 227 ff.)	A. M. DALE 199
Seven Emendations	D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY 200
Two notes on the <i>Satires</i> of Horace	J. H. KELLS 202
<i>Thesmophoriazusae</i> 986	R. E. WYCHERLEY 205
Himerius and Athena	W. H. PLOMMER 206
Lucretius iii. 961-2	K. F. C. ROSE 207
Tacitus, <i>Annals</i> i. 32	D. S. ROBERTSON 208

### REVIEWS:

*Acta Congressus Madvigiani*, W. K. C. GUTHRIE, J. M. C. TOYNBEE, D. M. JONES, 208; *The Mycenaean Tablets*, ii (Bennett), *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos* (Bennett), A. J. BEATTIE, 213; *Mémoires de philologie mycénienne* (Lejeune), A. J. BEATTIE, 221; *The Decipherment of Linear B* (Chadwick), D. M. JONES, 222; *Mykenisch-griechische Personennamen* (Landau), D. M. JONES, 225; *From Mycenaean to Homer* (Webster), *Homer and the Homeric Tradition* (Whitman), J. A. DAVISON, 227; *Die Religiosität Pindars* (Thummler), H. J. ROSE, 231; *Pindars zweiter und sechster Paian* (Radt), H. T. DEAS, 233; *Anacreon* (Gentili), D. L. PAGE, 234; *Safo* (Galiano), D. L. PAGE, 238; *Aeschylus* (Weir Smyth, Lloyd-Jones), R. P. WINNINGTON-INGRAM, 239; *Aristophanes, Frogs* (Stanford), D. MERVYN JONES, 242; *Callimachus* (Trypanis), H. LLOYD-JONES, 244; *Plutarch, Moralia*, vol. xii (Cherniss, Helmbold), D. A. RUSSELL, 246; *Aelian, On Animals* vol. i (Scholfield), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 247; *Timaeus of Tauromenium* (Brown), H. D. WESTLAKE, 249; *Order and History*, ii, iii (Voegelin), G. B. KERFERD, 251; *Aristotle's Poetics* (Else), *Aristotle on Poetry and Style* (Grube), D. W. LUCAS, 252; *Ovidius, Die Fasten* (Bomer), E. J. KENNEY, 255; *Tacitus* (Syme), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 258; *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Hagendahl), S. L. GREENSLADE, 262; *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Mohrmann), R. BROWNING, 263; *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese* (Sartori), R. J. HOPPER, 266; *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Adcock), R. J. HOPPER, 268; *Dionysios I* (Strohacker), H. D. WESTLAKE, 269; *Rome et Véies* (Hubaux), H. J. ROSE, 271; *Appiani bellorum civilium liber i* (Gabba), E. BADIAN, 272; *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 B.C.* (Badian), H. H. SCULLARD, 274; *Roman History from Coins* (Grant), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 277; *Troy, Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII* (Blegen and others), F. H. STUBBINGS, 278; *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden* (Plekiet), A. M. WOODWARD, 280; *Iconografia romana imperiale, 222-285 d.C.* (Felletti Maj), J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 281; *D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson* (Thompson), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 283.

Short Reviews	284
Summaries of Periodicals	305
Notes and News	308
Books Received	310
Indexes	315

Continued from p. 2 of cover]

*Poetics* (Else), *Aristotle on Poetry and Style* (Grube), D. W. LUCAS, 252; *Ovidius, Die Fasten* (Bömer), E. J. KENNEY, 255; *Tacitus* (Syme), J. P. V. D. BALSDON, 258; *Latin Fathers and the Classics* (Hagendahl), S. L. GREENSLADE, 262; *Études sur le latin des chrétiens* (Mohrmann), R. BROWNING, 263; *Le eterie nella vita politica ateniese* (Sartori), R. J. HOPPER, 266; *The Greek and Macedonian Art of War* (Adcock), R. J. HOPPER, 268; *Dionysios I* (Strohecker), H. D. WESTLAKE, 269; *Rome et Vies* (Hubaux), H. J. ROSE, 271; *Appiani bellorum civilium liber i* (Gabba), E. BADIAN, 272; *Foreign Clientelae, 264-70 B.C.* (Badian), H. H. SCULLARD, 274; *Roman History from Coins* (Grant), C. H. V. SUTHERLAND, 277; *Troy, Settlements VIIa, VIIb, and VIII* (Blegen and others), F. H. STUBBINGS, 278; *The Greek Inscriptions in the Rijksmuseum at Leyden* (Plekct), A. M. WOODWARD, 280; *Iconografia romana imperiale, 222-285 d. C.* (Felletti Maj), J. M. C. TOYNBEE, 281; *D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson* (Thompson), D. E. EICHHOLZ, 283.

Short Reviews	284
Summaries of Periodicals	305
Notes and News	308
Books Received	310
Indexes	315

## The Classical Association

The objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 30s., *Quarterly* 25s.; combined subscription £2. 13s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 20s.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-7) and of the volume for 1939-45 can still be obtained for 6s. each from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply many of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mrs. Hooker, The University, Birmingham 3. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northamptonshire, North Staffordshire, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales (Bangor), Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western (Exeter), Sussex, Swansea, Tees-side, Worcester and Malvern.



# THE BRITISH ACADEMY

## CROMER GREEK PRIZE

WITH the view of maintaining and encouraging the study of Greek, particularly among the young, the late Lord Cromer founded a Prize, to be administered by the British Academy, for the best Essay on any subject connected with the language, history, art, literature, or philosophy of Ancient Greece.

The Prize, which is ordinarily a sum of £150, is awarded every second year, under the following Rules:—

1. Competition is open to all British subjects and subjects of Eire of either sex who will be under thirty-five years of age on 31 December preceding the award.

2. Any such person desirous of competing for the Prize to be awarded in 1961 must send in to the Secretary of the British Academy on or before 1 June 1960 the title of the subject proposed by him or her. The Academy may approve (with or without modification) or disapprove the subject; their decision will be intimated to the competitor as soon as possible.

3. Preference will be given, in approval of subjects proposed, to those which deal with aspects of the Greek genius and civilization of large and permanent significance over those which are of a minute or highly technical character.

4. Any Essay which has already received, or is in competition for, another prize of the same nature will be inadmissible. A candidate to whom the Prize has been awarded will not be eligible to compete for it again. But an Essay which has not received the Prize may be submitted again (with or without alteration) in a future year so long as the writer remains eligible under Rule 1.

5. Essays of which the subject has been approved must be sent in to the Secretary of the Academy on or before 31 December 1960. They must be typed or printed and should have a note attached stating the main sources of information used.

6. It is recommended that the Essays should not exceed 20,000 words, exclusive of notes. Notes should not run to an excessive length.

7. The Adjudicators shall be free to consider published work not submitted.

Communications should be addressed to 'The Secretary of the British Academy, Burlington Gardens, London, W. 1'.